

STUDENTS' AND PROFESSORS' PREFERENCES AND PERCEPTIONS
REGARDING CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN THE SKILL OF WRITING IN AN
ENGLISH TEACHING PROGRAM

Emanuel Pineda Velásquez

Sebastián Quintero Valdés

Yeison Ossa Trejos

Universidad Tecnológica de Pereira

Facultad de Bellas Artes y Humanidades

Licenciatura en Bilingüismo con Énfasis en Inglés

2018

STUDENTS' AND PROFESSORS' PREFERENCES AND PERCEPTIONS
REGARDING CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN THE SKILL OF WRITING IN AN
ENGLISH TEACHING PROGRAM

Emanuel Pineda Velásquez

Sebastián Quintero Valdés

Yeison Ossa Trejos

Trabajo de grado como requisito parcial para obtener el título de:

Licenciado en Bilingüismo con Énfasis en Inglés

Asesor:

Dolly Ramos Gallego

Universidad Tecnológica de Pereira

Facultad de Bellas Artes y Humanidades

Licenciatura en Bilingüismo con Énfasis en Inglés

2018

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to depict both the preferences and perceptions that EFL students and professors in an English Language Teaching program had with respect to the role of corrective feedback in the skill in writing. The research was conducted in a Colombian public university in the city of Pereira with two male and four female students who attended language courses, and two female professors who were in charge of introduction to qualitative research courses. The methods implemented for gathering the data were individual and stimulated recall interviews so as for the researchers to collect paramount evidence considering both students' and professors' insights, as well as the corrective feedback provided on the students' artefacts. The research question that enlightened this research was "What are students' and professors' preferences and perceptions regarding corrective feedback in the skill of writing in an English Language Teaching program in Pereira?"

The findings denoted that in spite of the fact that professors are fond of providing implicit and metalinguistic corrective feedback as they trigger EFL pupils' critical awareness upon mistakes, students are keen on receiving explicit corrective feedback given that it addresses directly the mistake by giving the appropriate correction. Conclusively, this qualitative case study attempted at describing and discussing the important role corrective feedback has in an academic setting for potential English as foreign language teachers who are willing to improve both their language and teaching competences.

Key words: Preferences, Perceptions, Corrective Feedback, Explicit Correction, Implicit Correction, Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback, Errors.

RESUMEN

El propósito del estudio es representar las preferencias y percepciones de los estudiantes y profesores del programa de bilingüismo con respecto al rol de la retroalimentación en la habilidad de escritura. La investigación fue conducida en una universidad pública colombiana en la ciudad de Pereira con dos estudiantes masculinas y cuatro mujeres que atendieron cursos de lenguas, y dos profesoras que estaban a cargo de introducción a la investigación cualitativa. Los métodos utilizados para recolectar información fueron entrevistas individuales y de recuerdo estimulado para reunir evidencias sobre las percepciones de los estudiantes y los profesores, así como los comentarios correctivos proporcionados en los artefactos de los estudiantes. La pregunta de investigación fue “¿Cuáles son las preferencias y percepciones de los estudiantes y profesores respecto a la retroalimentación correctiva en la habilidad de escritura en un programa de inglés en Pereira?”

Conclusivamente, este estudio de caso cualitativo intentó describir y debatir el importante papel que la retroalimentación correctiva tiene en un entorno académico para posibles profesores de inglés como lengua extranjera que desean mejorar tanto su idioma como sus competencias de enseñanza.

Palabras claves: Preferencias, Percepciones, Retroalimentación Correctiva, Corrección Explícita, Corrección Implícita, Corrección Metalingüística, Errores.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are no words that can describe how happy I feel right now... After all, the sunshine of accomplishment has lighted the gloom of torment and uncertainty. That is why I would like to express gratitude to my parents, sister and friends who supported through tough moments in which I was about to quit. This is for you, without any of your love and patience, nothing would have been achieved. Gladis, Leonardo, and Manuela, you do not know how grateful I am for all the love and confidence that you have relied on me, I truly hope that I was worthy of it. Remarkably, kudos to my parents who in spite of the hardships of poverty and danger, were brave enough to raise me surrounded by plenty of commodities, and more importantly, love and kindness. Even though this might sound a bit egocentric, I would like to thank myself for being resilient in the dark times of my professional development, especially, when I was not even capable of writing simple sentences.

Likewise, I would like to show gratitude to my thesis co-workers: Yeison and Sebastian, who spent with me uncountable Sunday's evenings throughout the development of this research project. It is mandatory to acknowledge that our sleepless nights to fulfil with an assignment delivery have turned into the dream of being EFL teachers. Without your timely guidance and objectivity some chapters would still remain in blank. Thanks, panitas!. Furthermore, it is worth saying that Professor Dolly RamosGallego advising sessions were paramount for the construction, consolidation, and development of this thesis; I really appreciate your continuous feedback which allowed me to both increase and improve my expertise as an EFL educator. Thanks for your effort!

Emanuel Pineda Velásquez

Initially, I would like to thank both my parents, Raúl Quintero and Nancy Valdés, and my grandmother, Nucelly Osorio, for having invested in me, in my dreams and in my well being in spite of the hardships these years have bestowed. All three of you were always there with a kind and open heart, always hoping that I would prevail and always willing to help and counsel me. My greatest debt will always be with both of my mothers. Gloria, you are a magnificent and fearless woman who always taught me how to be a better person and man and Nucelly, you are the person that has always kept my pillar on check. I am also thankful with my brother for always being with me through all the adversities and inspiring me constantly. I love you, family!

I would also like to share my gratitude and my pride with my thesis partners, Yeison and Emanuel. I want to congratulate you fellas, you are great professionals, persons, and friends. It has been more than an honour to have shared so many instances with you. I am more than sure that I could have not found a better posse and it is more than obvious that such a research could not have been carried out without your talents. You have taught me valuable lessons and for that I am thankful. Additionally, it is extremely paramount to highlight Professor Dolly Ramos Gallego's guidance, wisdom, and attitude with us. You have taught us important lessons and, personally, I want to sincerely thank you for all the opportunities and professional growth you have granted me, you were a great mentor, professor, and assessor.

Finally, I would like to thank my girlfriend, Jessica, and my great friend, Jesús, for caring about this process and guiding me. Your contributions and wisdom are always appreciated.

Sebastián Quintero Valdés

I would like to start by mentioning the most important person in my life: my charming, loving, caring, and amazing mother, Maria Eugenia Ossa. Likewise, I am forever grateful with my step-brother Hermes Aurelio Díaz Fernandez, whose unconditional support throughout my stay in the program was paramount to make this dream come true. Both of them have made countless efforts to help me achieve this great accomplishment in my life: becoming a professional language teacher. I would not be who I am, nor would have I come this far without their guidance, love, and support. Additionally, I want to thank both my brothers Sebastián Díaz Ossa and Julio César Ossa Trejos for always being there to keep me going through the difficult times I have encountered along my path. Their true love and care for me have been a pillar to be where I am today. I am forever in debt with them.

Likewise, I would like to extend my most sincere gratitude to my friends and research mates Emanuel Pineda and Sebastián Quintero for their hard work and willingness to help me build this shared dream. They are both remarkable people who have contributed greatly to my personal and professional growth over the last five years. Needless to say that without them by my side conducting such study could not have been possible. Thank you for sharing your knowledge, effort, suffering, concerns and passion alongside mine.

Finally, I would like to mention our professor and adviser Dolly Ramos Gallego, whose guidance, patience and professionalism have meant the world to us. Her unconditional support and contribution to our project have taken us all the way to the end. I personally want to say thank you for helping me become a better student, researcher and teacher. No words can be used to describe my gratitude towards you.

Yeison Ossa Trejos

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>ABSTRACT</u>	iii
<u>RESUMEN</u>	iv
<u>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</u>	v
<u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u>	viii
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1
<u>1.STATE OF THE PROBLEM</u>	3
<u>2. LITERATURE REVIEW</u>	13
<u>3. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK</u>	21
<u>3.1 Feedback</u>	22
<u>3.1.1Feedback as a Part of Formative Assessment</u>	23
<u>3.1.2Types of Feedback</u>	24
<u>3.1.3Corrective Feedback</u>	24
<u>3.1.3.1 Types of Corrective Feedback</u>	25
<u>3.2 Language Skills</u>	28
<u>3.2.1 Productive Skills</u>	28
<u>3.2.2 Writing</u>	29
<u>3.2.2.1 Features of Writing</u>	30
<u>3.2.2.2 Handwriting</u>	30
<u>3.2.2.3 Typing</u>	31

<u>4. METHODOLOGY</u>	32
<u>4.1Type of study</u>	32
<u>4.1.2 Qualitative research study</u>	32
<u>4.1.3 Case study</u>	34
<u>4.2Context and Setting</u>	34
<u>4.3 Participants</u>	36
<u>4.3.1 Students</u>	37
<u>4.3.2 Professors</u>	38
<u>4.4 Researcher's role</u>	38
<u>4.5 Data collection techniques</u>	39
<u>4.5.1 Interviews</u>	39
<u>4.5.2 Students' artifacts</u>	40
<u>4.5.3 Stimulated recall</u>	41
<u>4.6 Data Analysis</u>	42
<u>4.6.1 Grounded Theory</u>	42
<u>4.6.1.1 Coding</u>	42
<u>4.6.1.2 Categories</u>	43
<u>4.6.1.3 Constant comparative analysis</u>	43
<u>4.6.1.4 Theoretical sensitivity</u>	44
<u>4.7Ethical Considerations</u>	44
<u>5.FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION</u>	49
<u>5.1 Student's perception of personal and professional benefits of feedback on students' papers</u>	49

<u>5.1.1 Students' regards concerning the impact of written corrective feedback on their cognitive and motivational development.</u>	50
<u>5.1.2 Students' interest in their professional development due to written corrective feedback.</u>	55
<u>5.2 Students and professors' preferences regarding error correction in the skill of writing.</u>	58
<u>5.2.1 Students' preferred corrective feedback techniques in written compositions.</u>	59
<u>5.2.2 Professors' preferred corrective feedback technique when dealing with written tasks.</u>	64
<u>5.3 Professors' perceptions regarding the impact of their preferred written corrective feedback on students' writing.</u>	68
<u>6.LIMITATIONS.</u>	74
<u>7.CONCLUSIONS.</u>	76
<u>8.PEDAGOGICAL AND RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS.</u>	79
<u>9.REFERENCES.</u>	82

INTRODUCTION

This qualitative-descriptive case study targeted eighth semester teachers-to-be and professors of an English teaching program at a t-state university in Pereira in order to retrieve their preferences and perceptions towards written corrective feedback. This project was carried out so as to understand how these populations conceive written corrective techniques and its benefits on learners' professionally and academically. This document covers in depth the theoretical contributions of other authors, the methodological aspects that were endowed and the results that were encountered. Initially, readers are be contextualized with the phenomenon and why it was important to conduct this research project; more specifically, what were professors' and learners' notions and regards towards written corrective feedback in an English Teaching Program at a T-state university in Pereira. Later, the theoretical framework, comprised of both the conceptual framework and the literature review, portrays definitions of authors such as Brookhart (2009), Ur (1999), Ellis (2009), and Harmer (2011), among others. It also exposes valuable studies that may have certain resemblances as Ramos, Díaz, and Echeverry (2016), Dincer and Seker (2014), and Arias, Cárdenas, and Ramos (2013). Moreover, a further section details the project's methodology. It inspects the type of study, context and setting, participants and how the data was gathered and analyzed. Additionally, the findings and discussion were framed based on the results that were encountered in the interviews and stimulated recalls. These were categorized into three umbrella findings: first, students' perception of personal and professional benefits of feedback on their papers; second, students' and professors'

preferences regarding error correction in the skill of writing; third, professors' perceptions regarding the impact of their preferred written corrective feedback on students' writing.

The first finding alludes learners' interpretations, regards and understanding of how feedback in written production influences their written proficiency and future performances, both as users who will do future written tasks and as prospective EFL teachers. The second finding depicts professors' and teacher trainees' considerations of the most preferable corrective technique and the correlations and discrepancies among these. The third finding comprises professors' regards of how the corrective technique they mainly employ prompts learners' development of written tasks and the skill of writing itself.

Furthermore, the constraints that were encountered during the project are displayed. These obstacles distressed the natural development of the project as they required a solution or a meticulous analysis. For instance, the subject teachers-to-be had misconceptions differing different corrective techniques, the data collection instruments required additional modifications and adjustments, displacing further the expected chronogram, this affected directly the gathering of data from various learners; hence, its interpretations were postponed. Another factor that profoundly complicated the elaboration of the project was the availability and willingness. Finally, the pedagogical and research implications suggest the importance of professors being equipped with sufficient corrective techniques in order to approach errors and mistakes efficiently and effectively as well as taking into considerations learners' regards and preferences. It also heightens the need to ponder on

why learners repeatedly commit the same mistakes despite of having corrective cues. It is also valuable to consider the application of a similar study with a greater population and to administer a similar inquiry in secondary schools, students of different semesters in the same ELT program, or from English language institutes.

1. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The influence of globalization and the global market have given English an important role in Colombia if one intends to be competent in this scenario. Over the last two decades, the Colombian government has established international trade agreements with different countries around the world. First, César Gaviria Trujillo's government introduced the *Apertura Económica* trade in which Colombia made alliances with countries such as the United States, China, and the European Union. Then, Juan Manuel Santos brought in the *Tratado de Libre Comercio (TLC)*. For such reason, learning a foreign language has become a necessity, more specifically English as it can be used as a lingua franca for international affairs.

Acquiring the title of a lingua franca due to its contribution in technological, economical, scientific, communicative, and educational fields (Ministerio de Educación Nacional, 2006), the Colombian government has chosen English as the official foreign language to be taught throughout the country in order to compete at international standards in economical, educational and professional domains (MEN, 2016). In this sense, historically, the Colombian government has carried into effect a number of language policies. This can be evidenced through policies implemented such as *The English Syllabus* and *The COFE Project* which sought to enhance learners' communicative abilities with the help of external organizations, namely the British council and Centro Colombo Americano. However, these language policies were not successful due to obscurity in what had to be taught and the materials that were to be implemented, teachers' lack of proficiency in English, and the development of a new constitution and of the General Education Law.

Another language policy carried out was *The National Bilingual Program 2004-2019* which was a long term and unprecedented plan but the Ministry of Education issued another program and The National Bilingual Program was canceled (Usma, 2009). A more recent language policy that emerged was *Colombia Very Well 2015-2025* which had a similar fate to The National Bilingual Program and was suspended by the current government which proposed and implemented the latest and current language policy named *Colombia Bilingüe*.

Colombia Bilingüe 2014-2018 is an agenda that seeks an holistic improvement in the language proficiency criteria proposed by the Council of Europe (2001). This is illustrated by the goals expected by 2018 which are increasing the pre intermediate (B1) level from 2% to 8% and the basic level (A2) from 7% to 35% (MEN). The Ministry of Education pursues to achieve these objectives by diagnosing the current level of all language teachers and those who are at basic levels (A1-A2) are capacitated to reach intermediate levels (B1-B2), in addition to a curriculum which has pedagogical materials and lesson plans is bestowed. Previous results of the SABER 11 tests applied in 2014 showed that 51% of future high school graduates (by that time) scored a –A1 level, 35% registered a A1 level, 7% were at a A2 and 7% were at a B1 and B+ level; Therefore, the Ministry of Education (MEN) stated that the Colombia Bilingüe language policy needs EFL teachers with B2 or higher English level of proficiency, who demonstrate adequate methodological and pedagogical strategies.

To illustrate the previous results, an investigation conducted by Arias, Cardenas, & Ramos (2013) in 12 out of 14 towns of Risaralda sought to depict students, teachers and

school administrative staff shared attitudes, perceptions and beliefs with regard to the learning and teaching of English in the local context. Among the results found in this study, the researchers highlight the constraints of the methodological manners of EFL teaching and learning environments caused by the over emphasis on the linguistic competence leaving aside both the pragmatic and sociolinguistic competences. The authors perceived that in EFL lessons, teachers tend to design and implement activities that promote Low Order Thinking Skills such as identifying, memorizing, summarizing, among others, thus, disabling students' cognitive capacities such as comparing, contrasting, criticizing, etc. In addition, regarding the four language skills, the study found out that only the skills of listening and writing are generally included in the lessons and students have few opportunities to develop the skills of reading and speaking due to the lack of exposure to authentic materials and pedagogical tools.

Considering the conclusions provided by Arias et al (2013), despite of the skill of writing is generally the most used productive skill in public schools in the region of Risaralda, students that enroll in the university present problems as its teaching and learning process can be challenged by the fact that it is a skill in which learners can commit recurrent mistakes and errors and students that enroll in public universities present problems . Consequently, teachers have the need of being capable of displaying a broad range of corrective feedback strategies which can enhance the writing ability. Feedback, as stated by Brookhart (2008), endows a double barrel approach which enhances both students' productive and receptive abilities and fosters motivation; thus, corrective feedback is the means by which professors notify explicitly or implicitly that a mistake has

occurred and that there is a gap in language (Zhao, 2009). As a result, it is important to consider students and teachers' preferences and perceptions towards corrective feedback. Foreign studies have aimed at portraying which corrective techniques are learners' preferred and whether there is a correlation with the technique provided by their instructors.

Dincer and Seker (2014) illustrated a research which attempted to retrieve students' perceptions and preferences towards feedback in writing classes in order to shape the feedback process in teaching contexts. This study aimed at gathering information about what types of feedback students mostly received and preferred at a preparatory level studying English at a T-state university in Turkey. Additionally, it also intended to perceive students' disposition towards feedback. The outcomes collected from this research show that there are minimum deviations between students' preferences towards what should be corrected and what the professors choose to correct. Both students and teachers regard that for an overall improvement of students' writing skill, both content and form has to be addressed. Therefore, feedback teachers provide to students has a relation with their needs; however, this investigation found that teachers scarcely embark on vocabulary usage, punctuation, and capitalization. Another result of this investigation is that students are fond of corrective feedback in general, especially in grammar, vocabulary, and content aspects; furthermore, they consider that feedback is a way of teachers showing their care. It is important to relate whether the results achieved in a different context as Turkey can be applied in a Colombian setting since social-cultural differences can exert different perspectives towards the role of feedback in the formative process of learners.

Differing from the previous investigation, Correa, Martinez, Molina, Silva and Torres (2012) conducted a study with six students and two teachers at a subsidized high school from Chile with the purpose of identifying the impact of explicit feedback on EFL high school students engaged in writing tasks. The results in this study indicate that teachers do not provide systematic feedback on content and organization and when they do so, they do it unconsciously. More importantly, the authors interpreted that even though there is no a culture of feedback among teachers and students as some EFL teachers do not have neither a specific criteria or techniques for correcting students nor they have consistency in the way they provide feedback. However, teachers tend to know how to assess error correction in writing tasks given the fact that they generally concentrate on and identify local errors. Regarding students' opinions, it can be inferred that they prefer not only to receive feedback explicitly since it helps to improve their written products, but also to be given feedback that comes from their partners. With this being said, the researchers conclude that explicit feedback can increase motivation among EFL students since it allows them to raise awareness of their writing skills by identifying both the positive aspects and the ones that need to be improved. It is paramount to have awareness of what aspects of language professors in Colombia engage on when correcting learners written products, seen as throughout different locations the notion of what should be corrected alters.

In a reflection provided by Giraldo and Perry (2008), the researchers demonstrate how the concept of writing has evolved throughout the last century. Initially, Audiolingualism viewed writing as a process that reinforced grammatical structures and was seen as a secondary skill. Later, Communicative Language Teaching continued

viewing writing as a secondary skill though it did not limit students' language and it viewed errors as normal. Such modern approach towards errors views them as necessary and even desirable for the learning process because it allows to diagnose students' current level and to work upon their flaws. Therefore, instructors are in the obligation of distinguishing between errors, lack of competence of the target language; mistakes, incorrect language forms of known structures; and interlanguage, limitations in the use of the target language in order to enhance learners' formative process. Additionally, learners' mistakes, regardless of their causes, affect readers differently. This is illustrated by Khalil (cited in Ellis, 1994 cited in Giraldo & Perry, 2008) who annotates three major criteria for determining errors: (a) intelligibility, interference with comprehension; (b) acceptability, recipients' bias of the seriousness of the errors, and (c) irritation, emotional reactions evoked by errors.

Consequently, inquirers assert that not only correcting explicitly students' papers is important, but also that it is paramount to foster a constructive view of writing as well as empowering learners to be in charge of their own revision, self-monitoring, and self-correction process. Considering that oral production is the productive skill most commonly craved in educational settings nowadays due to Communicative Language Teaching, it can be said that this approach results in lack of literature and investigations in writing and how it should be corrected.

Writing is a long process which requires a continuous guidance and assessment for the reason that it takes place in different stages in order to transmit the writer's opinions appropriately regardless the topic. In a research developed by Alvira (2016) at Universidad de La Sabana comprising 18 university students at B1 level of English, the researcher

questions what the impact of coded feedback is on learners' performance. In order to engage students' papers, educators must distinguish what the process of writing implies. Thus, Merriwether (1997), mentioned in Alvira (2016), proclaims four categories which are: (a) Prewriting, where the author chooses the topic; (b) Writing, which refers to displaying the author's thoughts; (c) Revising, editing the text; and (d) Evaluating in which the writer receives feedback regarding the final product. Following this line, corrective feedback should be implemented during the revising and evaluating stages considering that during those instances potential feedback benefits awareness on mistakes that hinder the writing process and they do not affect the writer's motivation with feedback that can raise their affective filter. Consequently, Alvira (2016) argues that corrective feedback not only increases students' motivation but it also allows the inclusion of scaffolding techniques. Despite of the fact that the main finding was the autonomy improvement as it is stated that scaffolding students' writing process improves such a factor, Alvira (2016) also points out that the EFL learners increased significantly their writing performance in terms of coherence, and cohesion. Therefore, it is important to be aware of which stages professors are correcting students due to the fact that there are periods such as the revising and evaluation stages in which feedback is more pertinent and effective.

Ramos, Díaz, and Echeverry, (2016) highlighted the perceptions of professors and students of an English Language Teaching program regarding oral corrective feedback. This research was conducted in a Colombian T-state University in Pereira with 7 professors and 21 students. The investigators questioned about the perceptions of ELT professors and students towards corrective feedback in oral production. The results achieved from this

investigation demonstrated that even though professors are aware of corrective feedback, it is not provided in a conscious way; additionally, professors are concerned with the negative impact of error correction on students' performance. Though students and professors' perceptions towards corrective feedback has been already analyzed, it has not been applied on writing.

Conclusively, taking into account the lack of research with respect to preferences and perceptions towards corrective feedback in the skill of writing within prospective EFL teachers and professors, the present study attempts to address this population so as to arrive at a better understanding of the phenomenon. A study addressing beliefs and perceptions regarding error correction in oral production was conducted in the Colombian context by Ramos et al (2016) at Universidad Tecnológica de Pereira with regards to students and professors' preferences regarding corrective feedback in oral production. Its written counterpart, by contrast, has been not been explored in the local context creating a gap which needs to be deeply diagnosed. On the other hand, foreign studies conducted by Correa et al (2012) and Dincer & Seker (2014) in Chile and Turkey, respectively, concerned with the role of corrective feedback in writing have been carried out, it is vital to consider that aspects such as perceptions and preferences may vary depending on people's cultural background.

Thus, considering that the phenomenon concerning pupils' and instructors' inclinations and understandings of how feedback should be imparted and which techniques are more effective and appealing for each population has not been heavily studied and even though there are foreign investigations that address similar circumstances regarding how

the role of corrective feedback in the skill of writing is conceived, these can differ due to contextual differences; this study intends to acquaint on such occurrences in the Colombian context. Therefore, the purpose of this research is to aim at portraying EFL students and professors' preferences and perceptions towards corrective feedback in written production within an English Language Teaching program.

2.LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter will depict a series of investigations that have been developed, both foreignly and nationally, regarding EFL teachers and students' perceptions and interpretations towards error correction techniques applied in students productive skills. Brookhart (2008) affirms that not only does feedback deal with students' motivational factors but it also affects their cognitive process and, thus, it constitutes a paramount issue in foreign language teaching and learning scenarios. The studies that will further be mentioned have dealt with aspects such as teachers and students' preferences and perceptions regarding the role of feedback in language classes.

Hamouda (2011) carried out a research titled: *A study of students and teachers' preferences and attitudes towards correction of classroom written errors in Saudi EFL context*. In this research, the author intended on finding insights on how educators and learners think of error correction in written production, and pondered upon a superlative question which was 'what are students and teachers' preferences regarding error correction in EFL class?'. The participants of this study were 20 teachers and 200 students attending the Effective Academic Writing course from the preparatory year program at the Qassim University in Saudi Arabia who were given a survey containing close and open questions dealing with inclinations towards mistakes revision and the difficulties educators find at the moment of assessing student.

The writer came across with four (4) relevant findings in this study which indicate that (1) most students and teachers prefer to receive and provide feedback at the end of the writing process, (2) the majority of learners like to get all their mistakes corrected, (3)

structural errors are seen as the ones that need more attention, and finally, (4) most students consider that the teacher should be the main source of feedback. For this project, it is important to retrieve information concerning students and professors' regards towards the extent of their correction, whether they prefer being corrected mainly in terms of grammar, content or both and; finally, to ponder upon their preference and perception regarding who should be the main source of feedback. additionally, a similar study was carried out in a related context with an also familiar population.

Dincer and Seker (2014) were in charge of a study carried out in a foreign language school at a state university in Turkey titled: *An insight to students' perceptions on teachers feedback in second language writing classes*. The researchers intended to account for students' favourite corrective technique and with which teachers correct them the most, how they evaluate the impact of feedback on their foreign language improvement, their disposition towards the received feedback, and students' act upon the feedback they received. This inquiry was carried out with 468 students in a level between A1 to B1 in the ages ranging between 17 to 21. In order to gather this information the researchers implemented questionnaires for students' experiences and semi-structured interviews.

The findings achieved from this project were that there are deviations between students' preferences towards what should be corrected and what professors choose to correct. While students prefer an overall correction in all aspects as they consider them beneficial for improvement, teachers mainly correct grammar, content, and vocabulary and do not focus on aspects such as organization or spelling. Another result of this project is that students are fond of corrective feedback, especially when grammar, vocabulary, and

content aspects are reviewed; furthermore, they consider that feedback is a way of teachers to show their care. In this research project, it is also strictly important to encounter similar answers such as the feedback that students mainly receive and their preferred corrective technique, as well as their conception of feedback in their formative process. As seen in the results encountered by Dincer and Seker (2014), students are fond of being corrected, both in grammar and in content, it is important to assure that they reckon the corrective techniques to avoid uncertainties.

A qualitative study carried out in Chile by Correa, Martínez, Molina, Silva, and Torres (2012) titled: *The impact of explicit feedback on EFL high school students engaged in writing tasks* intended on retrieving what the impact of feedback on content and organization in writing tasks developed by learners of English at a public school would be. The target population were two groups: one group consisted of six third and fourth year students from a subsidised high school from Concepción, Chile. Their language proficiency was lower intermediate. The second group was comprised of two teachers who had five years of language teaching experience, belonging to the subsidised educational system. In order to gather such information, the researchers implemented a structured interview, which was conducted in students' native language, it focused on the importance of explicit corrective feedback in writing tasks, and a document analysis methodology.

Correa et al (2012) evidenced that feedback is effective when the teacher provides students with positive comments which encourage them to continue writing. It affects them cognitively in a positive manner due to the fact that the students understand the message and react. Additionally, students manifested hardships while receiving the corrective

feedback technique applied by the professor because of their low level of competence. Finally, the study asserts that students improved their tasks' content by following their teacher's comments. This research project is concerned with students' comprehensibility of the different corrective techniques that professors' use and if learners are capable of displaying the intended corrections furnished by the instructors; additionally, to retrieve information of pupils' disposition to correct professors' advice. For such reasons, it is important to reckon studies that have been carried at a local stage and their perceptions towards corrective feedback.

Schulz (2001) attempted to perceive what the perceptions of postsecondary Colombian EFL/FL students and teachers were regarding the role of explicit grammar study and error correction in learning a foreign language. The project was titled: *Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA- Colombia* which was concerned with a population of 122 foreign language instructors and eight different postsecondary institutions in Bogotá, along with 607 foreign language students. The writer retrieved such information with questionnaires; for the former, figures were collected at teacher development workshops while for the latter questionnaires were administered in class.

According to Schulz (2001), the results obtained from the study indicate that both EFL students and professors are fond of the role of correction in class and on written works; however, there was a deviation regarding the amount of feedback that had to be provided by the instructor. While professors prefer to target global errors, students prefer a more specific and meticulous approach to errors. Additionally, upon further investigation,

the researcher states students' esteem towards professor correction and their beliefs on how they develop their proficiency as a consequence of revision. As mentioned previously, it is important to reckon students and professors' beliefs towards corrective feedback and its effect on the development of proficiency.

Even though different studies have been carried out in different contexts with respect to the benefits of corrective feedback on students, the results have come into agreement regarding the fact that it can be fruitful when conducted appropriately. As proposed by Giraldo and Perry, (2008) who in a reflection titled: *Treating ESL Writing Errors: Balancing Form and Content* at a public university in Pereira, denoted that correcting written mistakes can be advantageous when applied on learners friendly. The investigators suggested that when correcting mistakes, EFL teachers must be illustrated in how to address error correction at the moment of providing feedback; it means, to which errors pay attention to, and which to ignore. Giraldo and Perry firmly believe that form-related mistakes ought not to be the main focus of correction as they do not hinder the writing development process, but EFL facilitators should provide different learning opportunities centered on content-related practice insofar as they promote and enhance EFL learners' writing abilities. Nonetheless, the scholars pointed out that both form and content should be treated in the learning environment regardless learners' language proficiency for the reason that both of them represent the writings' foundations.

In the Colombian context, students' and professors' preferences and perceptions regarding the role of corrective feedback in the skill of writing has been poorly explored, only few investigators have depicted these populations' insights regarding the impact of

corrective feedback in writing. Alvira (2006) one of them, in a qualitative research: *The impact of oral and written feedback on EFL writers with use of screencast* at a private university in Bogota with 18 university students at a B1 level, attempted at decoding what the impact of coded feedback is on learners' performance through the implementation of pre-study, post-study questionnaires, and subjects' artifacts. After carrying out the investigation, the author proposed that corrective feedback increases students' motivation given that it allows to scaffold students writing development, increasing their autonomy. Alvira expressed that through the use of coded (metalinguistic corrective feedback), written and oral feedback, EFL pupils improved their writing performance in terms of coherence and cohesion inasmuch as they had the chance of revising and polishing their written documents throughout the ongoing writing stages (prewriting, drafting, revising, and evaluating)

Feedback may be perceived either as an enriching or harmful procedure depending on people's background, culture, and personality. Hence, it is not only paramount to recognise how different educational groups react towards this process, but also how it is addressed, developed, and regarded. A qualitative research titled: *Professor and Students' Perceptions Towards Oral Corrective Feedback in an English Language Teaching Program*, developed by Diaz, Echeverry, and Ramos (2016) at a public university in Pereira with 7 professors and 15 students, endeavored to highlight the perceptions that professors and students of an English Language Teaching Program had regarding oral corrective feedback in language classes through the implementation of observations, interviews, and virtual questionnaires. The inquirers mentioned that teachers do not know

how to approach the issue of providing corrective feedback for spoken mistakes as they are not familiar with the error correction techniques with respect to the speaking skill. In spite of the fact that providing feedback might seem a tedious process because of its emotional implications, the authors expressed that the subject participants showed gratitude and respect towards their professors' intention to help them to improve their speaking skill.

Another local study carried out in the region was conducted by Arias, Cardenas, and Ramos (2013). The project named: *Retos y realidades de la enseñanza del inglés en Colombia [Challenges and Realities of Teaching English in Colombia]*, aimed at outlining students, teachers, and school administrative staff shared attitudes, perceptions and beliefs with respect to the learning and teaching of English in the local context. The study was developed in 12 out of 14 towns in the region of Risaralda. Among the conclusions provided by the inquirers is the fact that the skill of writing is generally the most worked on productive language skill throughout the region. This means that both its teaching and learning process may represent a challenge due to the fact that it is a skill in which learners tend to make recurrent mistakes and errors. As a consequence, EFL teachers ought to have a responsibility to display a broad range of corrective feedback strategies that permit to enhance the ability to write in English correctly. The aforementioned aspects reflect the imperative need to conduct a study which particularly depicts what EFL students and professors conceive and prefer with respect to the role of corrective feedback on the skill of writing in higher education contexts.

For the most part, it can be concluded that EFL learners tend to prefer all errors and mistakes corrected, while teachers and professors are more likely to go over the general

ones. In addition, corrective feedback is generally seen as having positive effects on students' improvement of writing skills as it paves the path for learners to become more aware of the aspects to improve and provides insight into what and how to proceed. Still, there seems to be a mismatch between students' perceptions towards and preferred corrective feedback techniques, and those professors usually apply to correct their pupils written products. Henceforth, the study at hand will attempt to address what students and professors from an English teaching program perceive with regards to the role of corrective feedback in written production so that the findings and conclusions permit to enlighten this particular unexplored population into what may be the most appropriate ways to approach the implementation of corrective feedback to develop the writing skill.

3. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The aim of the following chapter is to depict the key components that this paper perceives as its foundations in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context. For such reason, this study will be based on the preferences and perceptions emphasizing on corrective feedback in written production. In the same way, this chapter will define and encompass the relevant components that writing must contain to be fostered by expanding the scopes which are normally understood in regards of feedback and writing.

Initially, one of the main concepts bestowed on this study is feedback, how it nurtures students' performance and how it allows them develop their structural and communicative abilities (Ur, 1999). Thereby, feedback is considered as a part of formative assessment as it is concerned with cognitive and motivational factors alike (Brookhart, 2008) (Ellis, 2009). Therefore, in order to give students feedback about their mistakes, teachers can apply a corrective approach which can be either by explicit corrective feedback, making direct comments on students' mistakes; implicit corrective feedback, indicating an error but not providing a correction; or metalinguistic corrective feedback, error codes used by teachers. Seen as correcting students is beneficial in order to enhance their learning process, giving feedback is employed on language skills. Language skills can be either productive (written-oral) or receptive (listening-reading), the former being the channel by which a message is conveyed while the latter being the methods by which the message is inferred (Aydoğan and Akbarov, 2014). Consequently, it is not only pertinent to recognize the importance of oral production since it is the most common form of

communicating ideas, but also written communication which expresses ideas and transmits them to readers (Ur, 1999).

3.1 Feedback

Feedback is a useful and elemental instrument for an effective learning within the EFL domain considering that it draws learners' attention upon their performance when developing a task. Hereafter, Ur (1999) defines feedback as denoting students' mistakes or errors; in addition, to correcting and providing students information about their performance; the investigator makes a distinction of two key components of feedback: assessment which consists of notifying students of their errors and correction which provides students a determined information based on learners' production. Even though there are no significant discrepancies regarding feedback's definition, it is considered to be one of the most influential constituents for the development of foreign language proficiency, as stated by Black and Wiliam (1998) in Harmer (2011). Understanding feedback's value and interpreting it as a formative process in students, it resembles an effective way of assessing students. Similarly, Brookhart (2008) considers feedback as a resource which allows both instructors and learners to analyze whether students are achieving learning goals or not. In addition, this investigator expresses that formative feedback, which will be explained in the following section, influences both cognitive and affective factors at the same time when conducted appropriately. Whereby, as several methods of feedback can be embedded when correcting or assessing students' performance, it is necessary to discern between positive and negative feedback, so as to provide a proper formative process.

3.1.1 Feedback as a Part of Formative Assessment

Feedback is endowed with a double-barreled approach, as specified by Brookhart (2008), meaning that it is concerned with cognitive and motivational factors alike. The researcher remarks that if feedback is properly executed, it can address students' current proficiency and what they should do next to progress; consequently, formative assessment refers to the teachers' analysis upon the learning process in order to verify and modify the teaching and learning activities (Council of Europe, 2001); as well as conceding students awareness of their learning development and affecting positively their motivation. Furthermore, it is said that assessing or correcting students must be in a way such that learners comprehend what is being done; reaching a consensus of opinion with a theoretician like Krashen (1982) who claims that there are certain conditions for learners to acquire understandable knowledge according to the level that they currently have; it means, feedback should be conducted with an adjustable degree of intensity depending on learners' proficiency level.

Thus, taking these previous utterances into consideration, feedback ought to be remarked as a formative process for the adequate development of learners' skills, on account of conceding students mindfulness of their learning process and influencing students motivation. Secondly, feedback provided to students must be designed for their level of expertise and professors should accommodate and/or adapt to students (Spolsky, 1998). Notwithstanding, not only recognizing feedback as a part of formative assessment is illustrious, but also its types of feedback and their specificities.

3.1.2 Types of Feedback

Discerning feedback as an efficient constituent for effective teaching and language learning, as it fosters structural and communicative abilities in students, it has the capability of nurturing learner motivation and prompting their linguistic competences, Ellis (2009) assures feedback is of high regard in most second language learning theories. Hence, as a result of ruminating in the different types of feedback, the researcher resolves that feedback can be either positive or negative.

Positive feedback denotes students' empathy towards an activity. Moreover, it can also verify students' awareness and accuracy in their premises. Positive feedback can be seen as a way of complementing students' production, thereby encouraging students and cultivating their motivation towards language learning. It is the backchanneling devices implemented by the professor to reassure an adequate performance by using expressions such as "Good", "Yes" or "Excellent". Differing from positive feedback, negative feedback evidences students' flaws in their utterances whether it is due to veracity or because they are linguistically deviant. Negative feedback is set out to exhibit apprentices' mistakes with the purpose of them correcting them. To do so, teachers provide fixed phrase as "that is not right" or correction codes, similar to the ones provided in corrective feedback.

3.1.3 Corrective Feedback

Enlightening error correction as a negative type of feedback, Ellis (2009) considers that corrective feedback is principally a teacher's response to learners' linguistic mistakes. The researcher alludes to an investigation conducted by Ellis, Loewen and Erlam (2006) in which they remark three different rudiments for repairing students' mistakes, these are: (a)

indicating the error, (b) providing the correct form, and (c) offering metalinguistic information about the nature of the error, or any coalescing of the previous. In this paper, Ellis mentions Ellis and Sheen's (2006) assertion where they consider that corrective feedback is comprised by three stages; initially, there is a trigger or students' mistakes; later, the feedback move or the act of correcting itself; and finally, students' uptake or acquiring the consciousness of why something is wrong.

Therefore, corrective feedback is not solely a tool that teachers use to make an explicit statement of learners' linguistic mistakes and possibly acquainting students' awareness of their mistakes, but also, as Zhao (2009) referencing Schmidt (1990, 1995), corrective feedback grants learners' to discern between the gap of interlanguage (language production generated by an individual's first and second/foreign language) and the target form.

3.1.3.1 Types of Corrective Feedback

The function of corrective feedback has taken significant importance given that some authors have labeled error correction into different categories based on their investigations. According to Zhao (2009), corrective feedback can be regarded as both explicit or implicit. While the former has to do with the provision of a direct indicator of an error, the former does not directly point out the error committed. Implicit feedback is often conducted through the use of recasts (revisions) whereas explicit feedback can be achieved by means of either direct feedback or metalinguistic feedback. Explicit feedback, as (Ellis et al., 2006) in Zhao (2009) asserts, involves teachers' immediate reaction highlighting that the learner's utterance is not correct, and therefore furnishes both positive and negative

grounds. On the other hand, metalinguistic feedback, states Lyster and Ranta (1997, p. 47) cited in Zhao (2009), refers to the comments, information, or questions regarding the correctness of the learner's statement, providing only negative evidence; by which, being aware of these two varieties of corrective feedback, will help the facilitator to assess the learners' undesired productions based on the teacher's intention.

Extending the concept of types of corrective feedback, Ellis (2009) expresses that Corrective Feedback (CF) can take three additional forms: (1) direct CF, (2) indirect CF, and (3) metalinguistic CF. Direct CF involves putting up the correct form for the learner. Ferris (op. cit.), cited in Ellis (2009), notes that this may be brought about by circling a needless word, phrase, or morpheme, adding a missing word or morpheme, and writing the appropriate form near the error. Direct CF is seen as positive in the sense that it leads learners into how to fix their errors, especially when learners are incapable of correcting themselves due to a lack of knowledge of the correct target form. Additionally, Ferris and Roberts (2001), as mentioned in Ellis (2009), believe that direct CF can be beneficial when used with learners whose proficiency level is fairly low. A final consideration highlights that direct CF can have negative effects with respect to meaningful learning since it does not demand learners to perform high order thinking skills by providing them with the desired language form.

Indirect CF also indicates that an error has been made but does not actually provide correction. It can be achieved through underscoring errors, using cursors, or by pointing out the line which encloses an error. Thus, this type of CF makes decisions regarding whether or not to indicate where the error has been committed. Indirect CF is thought to have an

advantage over the direct CF inasmuch as it leads to ‘guided learning and problem solving’, thus making learners to raise awareness on language forms, (Lalande 1982) in Ellis (2009). Considering the above reasons, indirect CF is reckoned as being more likely to accomplish long-term learning (Ferris and Roberts op. cit.) cited in Ellis (2009). Nevertheless, this claim has had mixed results due to the fact that some researchers have indeed found indirect feedback useful in helping students to correct their errors, whereas others have found no major discrepancies between these two forms of corrective feedback.

Moreover, metalinguistic CF is generally seen as offering EFL learners detailed information in regards of errors’ nature, which lead towards mistakes. These explicit comments are denoted as error codes, which are alphabetic acronyms for a determined mistake, i.e (W.W= wrong word). The alphabetic acronyms must be located above the error so as for the learners to be able to spot it. In spite of the fact that Lyster & Ranta (1997) explained in Zhao (2009), and Ferris & Robert (2001) mentioned in Ellis (2009) agree on the idea that metalinguistic CF triggers learners’ awareness upon encountered mistakes, the former considers that explicit comments entail towards a negative impact, whereas the latter suggests that this technique of corrective feedback supports pupils to self-edit their undesired linguistic productions.

In summation, these three categories may be useful when assessing learners taking into account which behavior (error) the teacher is aiming to change since, as it was illustrated above, each type of corrective feedback triggers a different skill. i.e Student A has written a short sentence with the inappropriate verb tense, so that the facilitator only underlies (indirect CF) the wrong word so as to active the student’s ability to recognise and

infer a mistake. Seen as these techniques can affect students' awareness of mistakes, it is important to be aware of professors' professional criteria concerning the application of one method instead of another and the possible impact a specific procedure may have on students. Therefore, this investigation attempts to evoke facilitators and students' inclinations and considerations of which method they regarded as more effective, useful, or simpler than another, enabling students to correct their papers and professors to correct them efficiently.

3.2 Language Skills

In the field of EFL, educators have established four basic language skills videlicet: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Another way researchers elucidate the previous is by naming them “macro-skills”, as affirmed by Aydoğan and Akbarov (2014). Therefore, language skills are the sources by which the transmitter of a message creates signals, written or oral (productive skills), in order to communicate a message to a receiver, who must infer the intended meaning through receptive skills (reading, listening) (Aydoğan et al, 2014) (Shannon & Weaver, 1949). Accordingly, each receptive skill responds and relates to a certain productive skill; hence, listening is the receptive skill to speaking while reading is the receptive skill to writing. Therefore, it is important to consider people's output as these are the ways in which a person conveys linguistic messages.

3.2.1 Productive Skills

Language skills are denoted as a conjunction of productive (speaking, writing) and receptive (listening, reading) skills. Thus, productive skills are contemplated as learners' output to L2. Therefore, Nasr (1994) announces that productive skills are the means by

which students produce and communicate their ideas. Hence, the researcher appeals to Nasr (1994) in his paper, expressing that the four language skills are dependent of each other; additionally, the author specifies that in order to produce language it is imperative to receive instruction or input in receptive skills, as it prompts its development and eases the process of producing language. As each productive skill is related to a determined receptive skill (speaking with listening and writing with reading), it is inconceivable to ponder on the idea of teaching separately productive skills from its receptive skill; however, they (reading-writing and listening- speaking) can develop at a different pace (Aydoğan et al, 2014). Thence so, productive skills are the means by which learners convey linguistic messages, one of which is through written means.

3.2.2 Writing

Throughout different instances, the notion of writing and its importance has changed; beforehand, writing was gazed as a mere simulation of oral production and that there were no meaningful differences between oral and written proficiency; a previous thought which is considered outdated and archaic (Brown, 2000). These previous beliefs, as Coulmas (2003) affirms, are due to cultural differences in conjunction with historical insights. Additionally, the researcher pronounced six definitions of writing, namely writing as a system of graphs which is recorded as to represent a language, putting into practice such a scheme, texts themselves, types of texts, artistic compositions, and professional occupations. Concurring with a relatable definition, Ur (1999) depicts writing as a method of expressing ideas and transmitting them to readers.

3.2.2.1 Features of Writing

As the main core of this project is to come up with EFL teachers and students' preferences and perceptions with respect to the role of corrective feedback in the skill of writing, it is paramount to decipher its features or characteristics given that lettered mistakes might appear in hand-written or digital formats. Considering the previous, a feature is intended as a variation and distinctive attribute of an object or individual. For that reason, written texts may modify its forms depending on authors' inclinations towards documents made by handwriting or typing.

3.2.2.2 Handwriting

An essential tool of learning in daily education is handwriting as a result of the fact that it is used in many subjects for fulfilling and submitting assignments; whence, understanding this characteristic of writing is important in order to know how to correct it. As stated by Huber & Headrick (1999), handwriting is an extremely intricate perceptual-motor skill which, once acquired, becomes so automatic and usual that people tend to disregard its difficulty. It has been considered one of the most remarkable accomplishments of the human hand, and since the skill of writing goes in direct relation with cultures, and as these experience regular change, its unfolding represents great entanglement. Differences in class, system, and national characteristics are indicators of this culture-dependent relationship. Writing is not seen as the result of isolated actions but instead as a connected and ongoing task which, when properly done, represents handwriting skills due to the smooth execution of a series of movements carried out at the precise moment and place in

the sequence. Thus, the particular characteristics of writing and therefore handwriting are determined by the array of these specific hand movements displayed by each individual.

3.2.2.3 Typing

Nowadays, submitting digital assignments is more common than before, the use of typed texts has increased due to technology growth. Whereby, typing has a significant influence in the educational domain for the sake of it refers to the process of transcribing or creating texts by touching the keycaps on a laptop, computer, typing machine and/or smartphones. Different from handwriting, typing can take multiple shapes, size, and color due to its technological support.

All in all, having a broad understanding of concepts such as feedback and its function as part of formative assessment, as well as its types of error and feedback: direct and indirect CF; productive skills as the means by which individuals produce language, in this case the skill of writing and its constituents; and the nature of mistakes and errors, is of high regard as they provide the theoretical foundation of this research. Therefore, in order to deeply understand learners' principal perceptions and preferences with reference to corrective feedback in written production, this study aims at using the aforementioned definitions to serve as a guide to effectively address the issues at hand and thus shed some light on the importance of enhancing future teaching practices by considering students' main concerns when it comes to correcting their written products during the process of learning a foreign language.

4. METHODOLOGY

This research study was conducted with the objective of identifying the preferences and perceptions that both professors and students of an English Language Teaching program have in relation to corrective feedback in written production. In order to accomplish this study, the type of research, the context and setting where it took place, the participants concerned, the data collection methods, the analysis of the information, and the ethical considerations will be widely illustrated in the following section.

4.1 Type of study

The present research project was developed within the frame of a qualitative-descriptive, case study. The aforementioned terms will be branched off in three separate classifications with the purpose of providing a detailed explanation of each one of them and arrive at a better general understanding of what the study entails.

4.1.2 Qualitative research study

Reality is created upon the interaction of members of a society; thus, researchers try to comprehend the meaning that such members have co-constructed, how they understand and how they experience the world (Sherman & Webb, 1998, p.7) in (Merriam, 1998). Furthermore, Patton (1988) in Merriam (1998) declares that the purpose of qualitative research is not to predict to the future, but to understand the nature of settings. In this sense, this study was encompassed as a qualitative research study seen as it involves analyzing and interpreting a social phenomenon (Merriam, 2009), in this case students' and professors' preferences and perceptions towards corrective feedback in written production in an EFL population.

Since a qualitative research is mainly focused on the analysis and interpretation of what is going on in a particular situation, in this case an educational scenario, (Fraenkel, Wallen and Hyun 2012) refer to the work of Bogdan & Biklen (2003) to describe five main features that characterize this type of research:

1. *The natural setting is considered as the main source of data.* This means that researchers are expected to spend an important amount of time in the particular environment of study in order to collect as much data as possible for the project.

2. *Data that are qualitative are gathered in the form of words and pictures instead of numbers* as researchers primary concern is to provide a thick description of people's behaviours, attitudes, actions, words, and so on.

3. *In qualitative inquiry researchers focus on both the process and the product* seen as the researcher is required not only to carefully observe and record the whole process of happenings in the setting but also to come to a clear understanding of what these phenomena reveal, the product.

4. *Inductive methods are employed to analyze data.* Qualitative studies require researchers to interpret their data throughout the entire process in order to create a picture of the phenomenon rather than formulating assumptions in advance.

5. *Being able to effectively interpret how people perceive and make sense of the world is a central concern for researchers.* In other words, researchers have the complex task of interpreting as precisely as possible assumptions, feelings, perceptions, and attitudes from the participants' viewpoint rather than merely narrating exactly what the subjects think.

The foregoing features were paramount for the development of this qualitative research study insofar as its main objective was to capture and interpret professors and students' preferences and perceptions with regard to the role of corrective feedback in written production in two Research courses in an English Language Teaching Program at Universidad Tecnológica de Pereira.

4.1.3 Case study

Descriptive case studies convey deep comprehension of events and how a specific population is involved and influenced by such circumstances. Moreover, it is concerned with the process, context, and findings of research than its variables, confirmations, and outcomes (Merriam, 1998). Miles & Huberman (1994) mentioned by Merriam (2009) perceive a case study as a phenomenon which takes place in a limited context, also known as a “bounded system”. In this sense, a case is a “tangible” event which can be evidenced within a specific scenario. Consequently, if the phenomenon is not observable, it is not a case study insofar as a bounded system is the essence of a determined fact. Hence, a case study approach was employed in this project due to the fact that the investigation is implemented in an EFL setting to analyze students' and professors' preferences and perceptions regarding error correction, as well as analysing different techniques manipulated by professors and their impact on students which are reflected on their reactions towards every written task.

4.2 Context and Setting

This study was carried out during the development of two Introduction to Qualitative Research courses of Licenciatura en Lengua Inglesa program (LLI), from

Universidad Tecnológica de Pereira (UTP), Colombia. This English teaching as a foreign language program (LLI) has two main objectives: (a) to prepare future EFL teachers-researchers to acquire knowledge and skills both in the pedagogical and research practices, and (b) to enable EFL teachers to effectively deal with the social, cultural and educational requirements designed by the Ministry of Education (MEN) and other regional educational institutions.

With regard to the pedagogical approaches employed in this ELT program, theories such as the humanistic, constructivist, and the critical-reflective normally inform professors' actions and decisions in the classroom with the purpose of training whole professionals capable of effectively applying the acquired knowledge within the program in their context, to raise awareness of the social problems that directly and indirectly impact the learners, and to critically reflect on their performance and practices in order to continually enhance the teaching and learning processes.

This English teaching program is constituted of 10 semesters. The first five semesters are intended to develop both students' communicative competence in English and pedagogical knowledge and skills necessary for their unfolding as future EFL teachers. Additionally, the remaining five semesters are mainly focused on the instruction of content-based subjects related to theories about the teaching and learning of languages, more specifically English in second and foreign contexts. For the purpose of the present study two courses of Introduction to Research from eighth semester were chosen as the target setting inasmuch as these are courses aimed at writing the theoretical basis that will guide the thesis project of the future graduates. Thus, one of the main tasks learners are asked to

perform within this course is to produce a variety of written products such as the literature review, the conceptual framework, the methodology, among others; being these potential sources of errors and mistakes that professors must correct in order to help learners come up with a high quality final written product, a requirement for students in this academic context. In order for this study to be developed, it was carried out with a small population of the aforementioned context.

This study involved two professors who were in charge of instructing both courses of Introduction to Research. This course corresponds to eighth semester in the English Teaching Program at a T-state university from Pereira. Even though these two have a total of 50 students in total, only three students per group were selected as subjects of analysis or six as a whole. The time of exposure to these sessions were four hours per week during 16 weeks.

4.3 Participants

For this research, there were three different types of participants: students and professors (population) whose perceptions were taken into consideration, and researchers who gathered, analyzed, and interpreted data. Nonetheless, the data was retrieved from small samples of two Introduction to Research courses. Fraenkel et al, (2012) define samples as small groups of large populations from which data are gathered. Based on this statement, these authors argue that before selecting a sample, the researcher first needs to identify the target population in order to reckon where the results may emerge from i.e. (students attending the Introduction to Research courses in ETP). In addition, Merriam (2009), who perceives sampling as the unit of analysis, classifies it into two main

categories: probability and nonprobability, yet this paper will be based on nonprobability sampling on the grounds that it leads to a logical reasoning only if the observer focuses on discovering what really happens in terms of phenomenon's nature and connotations. The targeted population was selected under a typical sampling technique since there were no special regards as any interviewee could fit the desired profile for this research; additionally, no special considerations were treated towards the selection of professors as they were chosen previously to the initiation of classes and were capacitated to guide such courses (Merriam, 2009).

4.3.1 Students

The students who were attending 8th semester are learners of an undergraduate English Language Teaching program (ELT). For this research, a total of six students took part in the study, three per group, only one member per project. The subjects of this research were students who at the moment of participating in the research had a language level of B2 seen as they could understand certain topics of their field of development, and could express themselves with certain degree fluency and spontaneity (Council of Europe, 2001). Additionally, learners' ages average between 18 to 23 years old and there was no special regard for their gender. The students selected as subjects of research were chosen mainly because of the time of exposure they had had to the English language up to that point in the program, nearly four years, which means they had already dealt with the production of a variety of written texts and thus had relevant opinions and perceptions with respect to how they felt about the ways teachers and professors usually provide feedback to their written products.

4.3.2 Professors

The chosen participants were two professors that teach Introduction to Qualitative Research courses at Universidad Tecnológica de Pereira in Pereira, Colombia. These subjects were also chosen without any special consideration for their gender and their ages, which range between 28 and 40 years old. These professors were not selected because of their educational backgrounds or degrees, but because they happened to be the ones in charge of instructing these courses, and therefore were constantly assessing students' written tasks. For this reason, the sampling technique that was applied was typical sampling as there were no special considerations for the selection of partakers since anybody guiding these courses could provide valuable information for the purpose of the study which was collecting professors' perceptions and thoughts with regards to the role of corrective feedback in writing.

4.4 Researcher's role

The primary functions of the researchers in this qualitative case study was to carry out semi-structured interviews and to analyze students' artifacts with the purpose of gathering data related to how both professors and students perceived the role of corrective feedback in written production. As Merriam (2009) suggests, part of the researcher's role is to identify issues that are not easily detected through observations and interviews, this means going beyond words to see the real meaning of the subjects' responses by using the investigator's knowledge and experience to effectively analyze collected data.

Following the aforementioned statement, the researchers in this study not only sought to obtain specific information from participants, but they also deeply analyzed what

professors and learners considered in terms of the use of corrective feedback in the skill of writing. Understanding aspects such as preferences and perceptions was of great relevance in order to arrive to findings and conclusions on this phenomenon. Thus, the methods implemented to collect such sort of information will be widely explained in the next section.

4.5. Data collection techniques

Preferences and perceptions may vary according to individuals' experiences. Therefore, this research encompasses collecting data based on students and professors' beliefs and regards towards corrective feedback in written output. In order to gather such abstract information, seen as it is "invisible and difficult to measure" (Merriam, 2009), the techniques for retrieving data in this study were (a) interviews, (b) students' artifacts, and (c) stimulated recall. Interviews (a) refers to an extensive examination of issues in different domains, students' artifacts (b) are learners' products or the tasks that are required for the class, and stimulated recall (c) is a technique that is applied to retrieve participants' considerations concerning their course of action.

4.5.1 Interviews

Interviewing is a technique which is applied by researchers with the intention of understanding participants' contemplations about a specific phenomenon (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012). Considering that feelings, thoughts, and intentions are difficult to infer precisely, interviewing is a technique which is applied for events that cannot be directly observed (Patton,?) in (Fraenkel et al, 2012). Thus, interviews are means by which researchers can corroborate the accuracy and validity of observed events. Bearing in mind

that interviews are a way of collecting intangible data, it is important to state that there are four types of interviews according to Fraenkel et al (2012). These are structured and semi-structured interviews, as well as informal and retrospective interviews. For the purpose of this study, semi-structured interviews were implemented.

Semi-structured interviews are designed to elicit particular information from interviewees through fixed verbal questionnaires; notwithstanding, it allows researchers certain degree of agency to ask additional questions that were not initially planned (Fraenkel et al, 2012). For such reason, the researchers in this study designed and applied a number of questions aimed at collecting information with regard to students and professors' opinions and fondness towards error correction in written production. Such interviews were recorded so that the researchers could access the information at any given point during the analysis and interpretation phase.

Even though interviewing was one of the most useful techniques used in this study since it demonstrated students and professors perceptions', another technique that was employed was retrieving students' artifacts so as to corroborate subjects' bias recovered in the interviews.

4.5.2 Students' artifacts

Real-life learning outcomes take place in the classroom; in this sense, analysing these authentic materials is relevant considering that they are students' result after performing a task. Lecompte & Preissle (1993) in Merriam (2009), depict artifacts as significant materials such as written and nonverbal products. In addition, Merriam (2009) perceives it as items which entail certain kind of interaction, it means learners' knowledge

representation (letters, recordings, and diaries) by submitting a determined assignment. . Therefore, this study analyzed EFL learners' written products, such as literature reviews, conceptual frameworks, methodologies, among others, in order to see if there were discrepancies and/or similarities between professors' preferences while giving feedback and the way they corrected students' papers. Also, to see if the application of such corrective techniques matched with what students conceived as their favorite methods for correction. Finally, it was important to accede to students' papers heeding that it was relevant to reckon the extent of the corrections they applied on their papers, recalling why they did such corrections, and their contemplations of the assessment provided to them.

4.5.3 Stimulated recall

Stimulated recall extracts and revokes interviewees' contemplations and approaches on an effectuated paper (Mackey & Gass, 2005) in (Fox-Turnbull, 2011). Stimulated recall allows participants to introspect on the processes that they conducted, bestowing researchers access to their cognitive and mental processes, having an overview of their impediments and hardships, as well as their strengths (Lyle, 2002) in (Fox-Turnbull, 2011). Hence, such methodology allowed to ponder into participants views, difficulties, and eases they encountered throughout a document. Allowing researchers to interpret partakers' views towards the corrective feedback techniques that were applied; noticing whether there were deviations and similarities between the two populations preferences; and the effectiveness they conferred on each technique were paramount to successfully achieve the purpose of this research project.

4.6. Data Analysis

By the time investigators gathered the required data to develop this research, it was mandatory to decode and understand it objectively regarding an unbiased approach towards the information obtained in order to reach valid and reliable interpretations. Dey (?), alleged that qualitative data analysis implies utilizing a broad range of methods with a variety of procedures and intentions, these depending on the data that is intended to be analyzed and the purpose researchers give to it.

4.6.1 Grounded Theory

The concept of grounded theory has undergone significant changes since it was bestowed by Glaser and Strauss in 1967. Grounded theory emerged as an alternative to traditional sociological research theories. It involves the gradual understanding and integration of categories of meaning from data, as Birks, M., & Mills, J. (2015) claim. Additionally, it is conceived both as a method and as a theory, the previous aims at providing guidelines on how to identify categories, making links between them, and establishing relations among them, the latter is the product of the process, it provides an explanation to understand a phenomenon. The researcher designates various principles that are inquired in order to engage and interact appropriately with encountered data, this research will applied the following items conveyed by the author: coding, categorizing, constant comparative analysis, and theoretical sensitivity.

4.6.1.1 Coding

Qualitative research stands out due to its way of gathering data, which is either collected through the use of observations, questionnaires or interviews. This obtained data

has a significant role insofar as it is the foundation of the potential outcomes. Hence, the aim of coding the data is to provide an holistic idea, and bring meaning of the information that the subjects' responses have bestowed within the study. Taking into account the aforementioned, Birks, M., & Mills, J. (2015) assert that coding is a process through which categories are recognised, and labeled meaningfully with the purpose of developing fresh data. As Grounded Theory attempts at promoting new theories, data codes ought not to be focused on the already existing academic formulations, but should be aligned with the participants' responses so that researchers' analysis might be emancipated from existing theories.

4.6.1.2 Categories

Categorizing consists in designating groups of codes that partake in similar characteristics among each other into given classifications. Categorizing can be conceived as descriptive, when the proposed codes deal with a low level of abstraction, or analytic, when the indicated codes are obscure and intricate. Nonetheless, both descriptive and analytic are based on the proximities and disparities among codes (Dey, 1999). It is paramount to remark that categorization of codes emerges from data and adapt along the research process.

4.6.1.3 Constant comparative analysis

This main purpose of this procedure is to let the coding process keep its drive by ensuring the identification of similarities and differences among the emerging categories. When a common feature of a particular phenomenon has been identified, the investigator now has the task of redirecting his efforts towards any discrepancies that may be found in a

category so as to discover any possible subcategories. In other words, constant comparative analysis allows the researcher to not only come up with categories but also to be able to classify the data into smaller units of meaning. As a result, the richness of the information in terms of complexity and variety can be addressed as the goal of this process is to connect and unify categories with the aim of identifying all sorts of variation through the emerging theory.

4.6.1.4 Theoretical sensitivity

It permits the researcher to move from mere description towards a more analytical level. In grounded theory, there has to be constant interaction between researcher and data in order to ask questions which are then modified by the emerging answers. This means that any previously found type of data such as concepts, categories, ideas, codes, etc. light up a different way from which to analyze the information so that the original construct may be further developed and adjusted. Here, the inquirer comes together with the data by formulating questions, carrying out comparisons and seeking for counterparts; processes that may demand the researcher to move back to source to gather additional information.

4.7 Ethical Considerations

Considering the interests and prosperity of targeted population is important, as researchers should paramountly avoid harming participants directly and indirectly. This could occur by belittling participants with potential outcomes because it can affect their reputation or credibility publicly. Taking into account the previous, direct drawbacks is when a subject can be addressed by others in a negative review, resulting in negative consequences, while indirect shortcomings can affect the reputation or affect economically

an institution, its students, or the parents. Therefore, it is important for researchers to apply mechanisms that can ensure the welfare and prestige of institutions and participants; ethical considerations have clear guidelines and processes provided by universities which cannot be overlooked. For this reason, these ethical considerations will play a fundamental role on this research when retrieving in-service and prospective teachers' inclinations and conceivings towards the role of corrective feedback in the skill of writing in an English Teaching Program.

Having a Valid Research Design and Minimizing Risk of Harm

The importance of having a research adequately designed is because it avoids wasting students' time and researchers' resources; this can impact students' desire to participate in further investigations (Lankshear & Knobel, 2004). Researchers should be aware of focusing only on the desired goals of the project, not additional information that could affect participants or an institution, and to be able of retrieving and analyzing outcomes within a specific time span. Taking into account the above, a valid research design also minimizes and foresees possible wrongdoings that could be caused by the study's outcomes or its data collection techniques. This research will only consider students and professors' preferences and perceptions with respect to written corrective feedback. For this, the targeted population will be questioned and students' workshops will be gathered so as to analyze and reflect upon their considerations on this particular aspect of the skill of writing without excluding, teasing or illing participants through the participant selection or their considerations. Keeping in mind that the aim of this project is interested with personal

affairs of the participants, it is indispensable to minimize intrusion, deceiving participants, and receiving informed consent from them.

Obtaining Informed Consent, Minimizing Intrusion, and Avoiding Deception

As inquirers are expected to collect professors and students' personal information as preferences and perceptions, which can be potentially intrusive, it is significant to inform them and ask for their consent. It is important to keep intrusion at a minimum scale, the setting in which partakers will be intervened with will be only the classroom and not meddling in unnecessary additional information for this project. Therefore, avoiding deceiving participants enrolled in this research is done by enlightening them with the general aims of the study and how they are involved with it, this can be done through a participant proxy or an information letter. Whereby, following the patterns of this project, the population involved with this research will be informed through a letter of what this investigation conveys and if they are willing to be enrolled in it. Contemplating such, obstructing and misleading associates has negative repercussions and false results so being transparent and conceding them confidentiality and anonymity is paramount.

Ensuring Confidentiality and Anonymity

This research is strictly concerned with the integrity and well-being of institutions, programs, and participants. Therefore, pseudonyms will be employed for the protection of students and professor identity. Furthermore, the name of the English Teaching Program and of the University will not be revealed to assure their status.

Demonstrate for Teachers Participants at all times, and Respect and Reciprocate

In spite of the fact that guaranteeing respect for subjects is a must during investigations, researchers ought not to take for granted that respectfulness is only shown by omitting students subjects' identities, but also by leaving aside participants' private lives. Furthermore, throughout this study teacher researchers will assure a high degree of professionalism and respect by making sure that targeted population's beliefs and values do not get affected by any mistake in the formulation of questions during interviews. Apart from demonstrating respect to subjects, participants involved in the study could obtain some sort of benefit from the investigation in terms of preferences and perceptions awareness, one's own reflection, and pedagogical procedures. Therefore, both in-service and pre-service teachers might enrich their pedagogical strategies regarding the error correction techniques by understanding others' contemplations and inclinations.

Avoiding coercion or manipulation

Enlightening manipulation as the "authority" that inquirers may use to influence participants' wills, responses, and participation, it is fundamental for researchers to have clearly defined roles in the study in order to avoid making subjects forced to either take part in the project or to provide responses that do not precisely represent their regards but instead are intended to fulfill the researcher's expectations. Therefore, in order to have a solid and valid research, inquirers will be fully aware of this relationship when interacting with subjects so as not to produce any negative impact on the stated goals of the study in turn. The unfolding of this investigation will be carried out taking into account the already

mentioned ethical principles in order for researchers to conduct a valid, solid, and serious study that will prevent researchers from performing inappropriate procedures and thus will produce outcomes which favour all those who have taken part in the project.

5. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the encountered findings will aim at depicting and portraying the purpose of this research, being the delineation of learners' and instructors' preferences and perceptions towards written correction. The gathered information will be thoroughly bolstered and conferred with datum provided by the different data collection techniques utilized in this research project.

Therefore, the depiction of students' and professors' likings and viewpoints in relation to written corrective feedback will be unfolded by interpreting pupils' and instructors' interviews and learners' stimulated recalls

5.1 Students' perceptions of personal and professional benefits of feedback on students' paper

This finding alludes to the learners' regards, understandings, and interpretations of how written corrective feedback impacts both, their written proficiency and future performance, both as individuals that will have to perform future written tasks and as prospective EFL teachers. This information relates to students' answers in the interviews and stimulated recalls. The collected data implies that written corrective feedback affects learners personally as it enhances their capability of writing by making them aware of their errors; additionally, it allows pupils to develop consciousness of their weaknesses in terms of writing and their current level regarding language proficiency, as stated by some students. Furthermore, subject participants also consider the fact that corrective feedback provides a professional improvement opportunity; meaning, they can become aware of the

different techniques that can be employed when addressing own or others' written errors; however, this cannot be generalized as some learners have difficulties interpreting the proposed correction given that they consider it vague or misleading. Continuing with this pattern of thinking, participants can reminisce when they were given feedback which strategies were more appropriate for correcting errors and how corrective techniques affected them emotionally. This finding was labeled by the influence corrective feedback in written production has on them professionally, emotionally and cognitively. Whereby, this paper will be centered on describing, reflecting and analysing subject participants' responses with respect to how corrective feedback allowed them enhance their abilities both in the personal and professional domain.

5.1.1 Students' regards concerning the impact of written corrective feedback on their cognitive and motivational development

Considering that perceptions may vary among beings, it is paramount to take into consideration that it is not possible to make a conclusive assertion or generalization with respect to the impact that written corrective feedback has on students. However, corrective feedback in written production enhances learning as it allows students to be aware of their mistakes by witnessing their errors through the application of techniques such as explicit corrective feedback, implicit corrective feedback, and metalinguistic corrective feedback, permitting them to improve their proficiency and competences in writing for potential tasks. Additionally, in relation to learners' responses and theory analysis, error correction also affects participants' emotionally mainly by prompting their motivation and willingness

towards the development of their papers. The data that is presented below was retrieved from a stimulated recall applied on students.

After receiving feedback and correcting the draft, do you consider that error correction is an essential part for your formative process? Why?

SRAGR1: Yes of course. It is essential because we are not perfect and I express an ideas that in my mind sound logical and clearly but at the moment to and external person reads my text can be confused for the readers so with feedback process we learnt how to express our ideas or to reflect in our mistakes to improve our writing.

According to participants, the role of corrective feedback is relevant while learning since it enables them to express cohesively and coherently an intended message. These messages might be misinterpreted due to the readers misconception of the constitution of sentences, whether it is caused by arranging sentences as in their native language or because there is a lack of expertise in their target language. These factors affect negatively the interpretation of the text, from a reader's perspective, of the author's intended message. Hence, corrective techniques enable pupils to formulate structured texts in such a manner that a message can be conveyed without the necessity of deciphering the author's intention. it also allows them to analyze diligently the current state in their writing proficiency and interpret their flaws and how they could potentially improve, this awareness of their errors is eminent as it contributes to them as learners and future teachers.

SRDGR2: Yes, because it shows a progress and tracing on your work to come up with a final production that aligns more to the ideal of our project. Also, because the paper not only relies on one perspective or partner's perspective but indeed on the professor's view which is important to have a greater objectiveness.

Learners also assert that written corrective feedback warrants the possibility of monitoring the development of their papers, it allows them to conceive their errors and to adjust and focalize the content of their projects to their true expectations without deviating from the main topic. For such reason, students consider that the professor's viewpoint is substantial, even more than their peers, since it permits them to attain a notion of what has to be accomplished with their project by being concise and precise.

SRJGR2: I do consider that error correction is an important part of our formative process since if we do not correct the mistakes that we have made we cannot grow as learners

There is a striking similarity between theory and praxis as feedback nurtures students' development without taking into consideration the context. This was evidenced as the partakers of this project have a similar consideration towards professors' feedback, they deem that it allows them to scrutinize the state of their written proficiency by interpreting their mistakes and reflecting on how they could improve on such aspects, heightening learners' awareness; hence, enabling them to center on the proper elaboration of written constructs. Considering subject participants' responses, it can be inferred that they deem that

errors concede a possibility for improvement as it enables pupils to make judgements of their current state and assess it positively in order to display an improvement. One of the main aspects feedback is in charge of impacting and enhancing is learners' cognitive factors (Brookhart, 2008). It is considered as an instrument that labels students' proficiency and addresses what should be done in order to develop their language abilities. For such reasons, it enables learners to interpret their learning process so as to substantiate and alter their approach towards writing meaning that this enlightened state of awareness will grant learners the capability of assessing on their own their capacities and what actions they can carry out to improve, in addition to conceding knowledge of their learning development (Council of Europe, 2001). Furthermore, in a foreign study conducted by Correa et al (2012) it is asserted that feedback affects students understanding and that learners refined their products' content by considering their teacher's comments.

Do you prefer when the professor provides feedback in a more individual personalized way, or do you prefer more group holistic feedback? And why?

LANG1: I prefer individual personalized feedback because I feel more comfortable with the professor. I feel like a relation //yes// between the professor and me, because when is a group feedback, I feel that the professor is criticizing my work.

IDG2: I consider that it is better individual feedback because I can recognize my, my mistakes, and I correct, but when it's group feedback is just for all

the group and maybe I see “oh !that’s not my problem” or something like that /True (laughers)/.

The perception of proximity or closeness between learners and professors is an influential thematic as students’ motivation and eagerness towards learning and their formative process might be hindered or prompted. Pupils consider that they have contiguity with their instructor when they are not triggered in public, it is essential for them to reckon that instructors go through their papers, analyzing them thoroughly and making them feel comfortable with the proposed corrections without being belittled. Continuing with these patterns of ideas, feedback, as denoted by Brookhart (2008), conveys a double barrel approach which enhances both students’ productive and receptive abilities and fosters motivation; thus, corrective feedback is the means by which professors notify explicitly or implicitly that a mistake has occurred and that there is a gap in language (Zhao, 2009). As a finding, it is important to consider students and teachers’ preferences and perceptions towards corrective feedback as the sample presented above proves how individual feedback triggers EFL students’ confidence and willingness when receiving feedback since they consider that they are neither being exposed, nor judged.

Furthermore, when feedback is granted in an individual and intimate way, learners consider that it enables them to recognize their errors as it allows them to go through their content and form mistakes in a more confidential and familiar manner by analyzing and interpreting them in-depth along their instructor. However, there is a sense of incorrigibility

or narcissism as there may reluctance towards group feedback and analyzing their papers in depth by themselves as there is a possibility that the global errors are not their “*problem*”.

5.1.2 Students’ interest in their professional development due to written corrective feedback

Feedback not only focuses on signaling students’ written errors, but also on empowering EFL learners with different strategies that can be used when reflecting upon error correction. Therefore, subject participants highlighted that after receiving feedback from their professors (educators who are in charge of university courses), they were being prepared for implementing these techniques at the moment of teaching English as a foreign language at schools or other institutions. Through the implementation of corrective feedback teachers to be were capable of spotting the nature of their mistakes and correcting them appropriately.

Do you conceive corrective feedback as a paramount factor for your formative process?

LANG1: Well, because first of all, ermm... we learn how to provide feedback for our future students, because we are teachers in development so we need to know that, end... second, that help us a lot to improve, ehh... our speech or our written text or... whatever.

IDG2: Yes, because I can improve... and in order to stay here I want to be a better, in order to be a good teacher or something like that because if the professor don’t give me feedback I consider that I’m the best... and it is not well (laughers)

EFL teachers, who are in charge of dictating English at public schools , have not only the role of scaffolding learners through the learning process, but also of assessing and correcting their productive mistakes. Considering the previous, being aware of when and how to address students' written errors is fundamental insofar as the main purpose of corrective feedback is modifying an incorrect linguistic message when communicating an academic or personal paper . As stated by the former participant, receiving feedback during their professional development in written tasks has been beneficial for their future practice as in-service teachers in view of the fact that they are being exposed to different techniques for correcting mistakes in the skill of writing which will be applied when they will be correcting learners' papers. Continuing with this pattern of professional development, the latter participant highlights the fact that EFL teachers to be must master both the pedagogical and epistemological field; which means, being exposed to a continuous improvement process through a rigorous analysis and reflection during feedback sessions. Hence, learners have to make emphasis on the importance of feedback in written tasks for the reason that EFL learners (teachers to be) tend to ignore their papers when they do not receive corrective feedback with respect to their productive performance as they consider that they have excelled in their performance and there is no need for making corrections.

In a reflection carried out by Giraldo and Perry (2008) the researchers analyze how writing has become a secondary skill due to Communicative Language Teaching; however, this view did not limit student's language and it viewed errors as a normal phenomenon. Such incident has placed errors in a center role for learners' formative process as they are

both necessary and desirable considering that it allows learners to diagnose their level and work on their flaws. Thus, both in-service and pre-service teachers have the need of being capable of displaying a broad range of corrective feedback strategies which can enhance EFL learners' writing abilities. Considering this analysis and subject participants' responses, it can be evidenced that implicitly, EFL teachers to be are being equipped with different corrective feedback strategies when receiving feedback from their professors that can be employed at the moment of addressing their potential pupils' written errors.

Besides, EFL teachers in development can take advantage of their experience to determine what corrective feedback techniques might be more fruitful for correcting students' mistakes as they have been exposed to different corrective techniques throughout their professional development so that they aware of the fact that each corrective technique is more beneficial considering learners' language proficiency level; it means, if they are at a basic level, explicit corrective feedback could be the more appropriate technique for the reason it denotes the nature of their mistakes.

One aspect that has not been consciously and formally done neither in language courses nor in content courses is the continuous explicit exposure to teaching corrective feedback techniques and strategies for teachers trainees to have a deeper understanding and knowledgeability on the matter as they are not used in all courses and there is not a consensus regarding corrective techniques. It is indeed a major opportunity for student teachers to learn from their professors when receiving feedback and correction on their written work so that they equip themselves for future practice. Nevertheless, trainee teachers should really reach this point of the program with a broader theoretical and

practical knowledge on how to provide effective corrective feedback in writing insofar as they have been exposed to different types corrective feedback in courses like Language Acquisition and Upper-intermediate English; this way they may not only better understand the correction provided to their papers, but also make more concise adjustments to their compositions. What is more, future teachers would also be consolidating their regards and opinions about how to give feedback in writing more when assuming their role as professional educators.

Luckily, this apparent lack of knowledge and awareness on how to properly provide feedback in writing may be tackled with the inclusion in the program of a new course about assessment which aims at providing teachers to be with the theoretical, pedagogical and educational tools to assess language skills successfully, being writing an important constituent.

5.2 Students and professors' preferences regarding error correction in the skill of writing

This finding aims at depicting which corrective feedback techniques are seen as the most preferable in writing by both teacher trainees and professors from the bilingual teaching program, how these preferences differ from or relate to each other, and what consequences may result from such discrepancies or similarities. Professors tend to apply techniques for correction that they conceive as the most adequate and/or they feel most comfortable with when providing feedback to written compositions. Yet, students' preferences on the matter do not seem to be considered when making decisions on how to correct their papers. Therefore, in this section a thorough analysis will attempt to shed light

on the impact that preferences by students and professors on written corrective feedback have in the development of the skill of writing in relation to academic texts.

5.2.1 Students' preferred corrective feedback techniques in written compositions

Coming to an agreement as to which technique for correction is the most suitable for improving the writing skill may lead to an endless discussion among all the individuals involved in the process, mainly between feedback providers (professors) and feedback recipients (students). However, when students' views are not considered, reaching such an agreement may become an even more complex task. In relation to subject participants' responses during the interview and stimulated recall phases, there seems to be a tendency on the students side towards receiving implicit correction in their papers, whilst some others are fond of explicit correction. Teachers to be state that through implicit feedback they are allowed to detect which parts of their texts need improvement while at the same time challenge themselves to spot what correction needs to be done rather than being explicitly signalled what to do. Those who prefer to receive explicit feedback state that not only does it help them identify what has been wrongly written, but also better understand what is the exact correction the professor expects from them. One interesting aspect emerges out of the above discussion: metalinguistic corrective feedback seems to be the least preferred technique among students.

Which technique do you like uhm do you prefer while being corrected explicit corrective feedback, implicit corrective feedback, metalinguistic corrective feedback, all of them? or if you have uhm another technique, please describe it

IPGR1: I'd say implicit uhm 'cause the professor can signal out what I need correct, yeah?

IAMGR1: A: I prefer implicitly corrective feedback. Because is more clear for me. I could see... eh... my mistake more easily than my code or umm... just erh... put the mistake and that's it.

Implicit corrective feedback focuses on pointing out indirectly EFL learners' written mistakes; it means, that the provided feedback attempts at leading pupils' attention towards an undesired production by signaling it. Considering both participants' responses, it can be inferred that they are fond of receiving indirect corrective feedback (implicit corrective feedback) insofar as it allows them to be aware of what they need to modify, as well as why they made the mistake. In spite of the fact that the subject participants' language proficiency is at a B2 level according to the CEF (considering the number of hours that they have been exposed to the language in the program), they have the tendency of taking for granted the unmarked mistakes as they deem that signaled errors are easier to correct. Different from metalinguistic corrective feedback, which requires high order thinking skills to interpret a specific code, implicit corrective feedback empowers learners with what they exactly need to rectify; in addition, as implicit corrective feedback emphasizes on highlighting what EFL learners ought to correct, the subject participants perceive it as their

preferred corrective technique given that it guides them through the correction process effectively without having to read the whole paper again to spot the mistake.

Which technique do you like uhm do you prefer while being corrected explicit corrective feedback, implicit corrective feedback, metalinguistic corrective feedback, all of them? or if you have uhm another technique, please describe it

IDRGR2:I... prefer explicit corrective feedback and implicit corrective feedback, why? Because with the explicit corrective feedback I can understand better what is the professor want that I need to correct, and with the implicit corrective feedback maybe I can recognize some mistakes and in this way I can correct... I can correct them in another way /Great/.

Explicit corrective feedback in writing, attempts at affecting directly a student's undesired linguistic message by signaling it out, as well as providing the correct structure.

Due to its explicitness, EFL learners are fond of this type of error correction insofar as it contributes effectively to gain grammatical accuracy without the need of pondering critically on the intended correction. On behalf of the previous subject participant, it can be said that s/he prefers explicit corrective feedback as it makes him/her aware of what and why s/he needs to correct. Besides, this subject participant highlights that the aforementioned type of corrective feedback is fruitful for his/her language development in terms of writing inasmuch as it facilitates the understanding of the professor's intention with respect to what is expected to modify. Nonetheless, the interviewee asserts that even though implicit corrective feedback guides EFL learners towards the mistake, s/he might

be able to identify few mistake considering his/her language proficiency and not all of them given that the professor's intention could be different compared to his/her interpretation.

IJCGR2: uhh I would say all of the above but with an explanation of why it's wrong, you know? In order to understand and comprehend the reasons of uhh why you're doing what you're doing and why it's not the correct way.

LARGR2: umm... I think I prefer the...// for example: if a student writes "I are", explicit corrective feedback would say "I am", and it would show them directly// Ohh! // if it's implicit, the professor circles it, or...underlines it, or highlights it// I prefer implicit // and if it's metalinguistic, umm...the professor just use "Gr", a symbol of grammar, or tense// I prefer implicit, it just shows like the... the... mistake you are having //yes// and lets you the possibility to correct, but not being correct.

Corrective Feedback in the skill of writing has the paramount role of scaffolding EFL pupils' language development through the reflection and correction upon written errors. Both subject participants mention that they agree on the fact that feedback should point out where the mistake is, as well as explain why it was made. Besides, the last subject participant states that both explicit and corrective feedback present different learning opportunities for making EFL learners reflect upon their mistakes for the reason that the former empowers pupils with the direct correction, while the latter attempts at guiding the learner through the correction process. Continuing with these patterns of ideas, both subject participants agree on the fact that regardless the type of corrective employed by the

facilitator, each revision strategy ought to be accompanied by a comment which explains the nature of the mistake. On the other hand, the latter interviewee deems that metalinguistic corrective feedback might be ambiguous as its codes convey several interpretations whilst direct and indirect feedback allow EFL learners spot the reasons behind the error.

Considering subject participants' insights, it can be asserted that they are fond of explicit and corrective feedback as these techniques scaffold them through the correction process both effectively and efficiently. Direct CF is seen as positive in the sense that it leads learners into how to fix their errors, especially when learners are incapable of correcting themselves due to a lack of knowledge of the correct target form. Additionally, Ferris and Roberts (2001), as mentioned in Ellis (2009), believe that direct CF can be beneficial when used with learners whose proficiency level is fairly low. A final consideration highlights that direct corrective feedback can have negative effects with respect to meaningful learning since it does not demand learners to perform high order thinking skills by providing them with the desired language form. Even though direct corrective feedback activates low-order thinking skills, EFL pupils perceive as their preferred technique as it is less time-consuming when addressing mistake by mistake.

Indirect corrective feedback also indicates that an error has been made but does not actually provide correction. It can be achieved through underscoring errors, using cursors, or by pointing out the line which encloses an error. Thus, this type of corrective feedback makes decisions regarding whether or not to indicate where the error has been committed. Indirect corrective is thought to have an advantage over the direct corrective feedback

inasmuch as it leads to ‘guided learning and problem solving’, thus making learners to raise awareness on language forms, (Lalande 1982) in Ellis (2009). Considering the above reasons, indirect corrective feedback is reckoned as being more likely to accomplish long-term learning (Ferris and Roberts op. cit.) cited in Ellis (2009). The aforementioned issues depict that in spite of the fact that direct and direct corrective involve less advantages in terms of critical thinking on EFL learners than metalinguistic corrective feedback, five out of six subject participants highlighted that implicit corrective feedback is their favorite technique when working on mistakes insofar as it is more beneficial for spotting each error constitution.

5.2.2 Professors’ preferred corrective feedback technique when dealing with written tasks

On behalf of professors, they asserted that their preferences towards how to best correct students’ compositions is usually based on their experience and educational backgrounds. Whether they are using the most appropriate techniques for correction or not, the feedback provided will not have the expected impact if students’ regards on the matter are not taken into consideration while correcting their papers. Based on the information extracted from professors during the data collection process, it has been made clear that there is a strong preference on professors’ procedural performance for the use of metalinguistic corrective feedback. Professor participants in the study assert that they usually use codes as a means of letting students know that a certain component of written language such as tense, word order, wrong word, tense, etc. has been erroneously utilized.

Professors also indicate that students have already been taught how to interpret the linguistic codes this technique comprises. Nevertheless, they do not seem to be aware that the use of metalinguistic correction does not match students' favourite way of being corrected, as a consequence a discrepancy between the two populations' regards on how to correct written products arises. Therefore, it is considerably important to figure professors' main corrective technique and for which reasons they apply them.

Which technique do you use mainly while correcting students? Metalinguistic corrective feedback (set of symbols or codes which highlight students mistakes explicitly), implicit corrective feedback (recast and signal where the mistake is through the use of underlining, highlighting, circling, and making it bold), explicit corrective feedback (provide students the pertinent corrections, avoids ambiguity or misinterpretations) or all of the above

IPANGR2: Basically, what I usually do is metalinguistic corrective feedback I just, let's say, for example if they have some mistakes regarding grammar I just have some corrective code and they just take a look at it and what does it mean the code and they correct it.

According to the subject professor's response, the most used and therefore preferred error correction technique she tends to apply is metalinguistic. The participant regards this technique as a simple way of showing students what type of error or mistake has been made enabling them to make the desired correction. Professors at this public

institution deem that teachers to be are already equipped with the knowledge of what these symbols or codes mean.

IPDGR1: I normally tend to use metalinguistic... I tend to use codes which I previously explained to students what they mean... eh hh... mmm... I use them because I want students to reflect upon what mistakes they have made, and to work on them, and to improve them. Nonetheless, I have noticed they don't work all the time... they... the students either do not apply, apply... but I don't know if they don't apply because they do not understand or maybe because they are too lazy to make the corrections.

Following what the subject participant states, a pattern seems to emerge: the use of metalinguistic correction as the preferred technique applied by professors in research courses where student researchers have to produce a significant amount of academic written language. According to this professor's response, students are able to understand the symbols and/or codes as they have been previously presented and explained to them. By using metalinguistic correction she intends to have students reflect upon what they have done erroneously and make improvements to their compositions. However, teacher trainees do not always carry out the suggested corrections either because they have difficulties understanding the metalinguistic codes, or simply due to them not wanting to do so. Considering this potential apparent lack of clarity when students address the corrective codes on their papers after receiving metalinguistic correction, one may prompted to think that there must be a mutual agreement among professors and students that enables the former population to take into consideration teachers to be viewpoints and preferences on

how their written texts could be best corrected, as students are not always able to understand or interpret some of the corrective codes provided by their professor.

It has been made clear throughout the present research that feedback is a paramount factor in education as it is a teacher's powerful and, if appropriately applied, effective tool by which learners can identify what aspects of their performance need to be enhanced to succeed in the learning process. As stated by Arias, Cardenas, & Ramos (2013), teachers have the need of being capable of displaying a broad range of corrective feedback strategies which can enhance the writing ability. Therefore, part of the successful development of writing skills in academics contexts is highly dependent on the educators' ability to effectively affect learners' language learning process by helping learners become aware of their flaws and aspects to improve through the correct application of error correction techniques.

The aforementioned aspects related to how feedback may affect positively or negatively learners' performance is closely connected to whether or not there is a consensus on both sides as to how and when to provide feedback. In his study titled: *Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA- Colombia*, Schulz (2001) concludes that even though that both EFL students and professors are fond of the role of correction in class and on written works, there was a deviation regarding the amount of feedback that had to be provided by the instructor. While professors prefer to target global errors, students prefer a more specific and meticulous approach to errors. This is an example that clearly illustrates the necessity of coming to an agreement between professors and students when it comes to

providing and/or receiving any kind of feedback in order to avoid the arise of discrepancies that may hinder both the teaching and learning process. In the present research project it has been noticed how professors and students' preferences in regards to error correction techniques seem to vary with respect to how to foster the development of writing skills in academic contexts. Although there may exist differences, it should not necessarily lead to thinking that something is being wrongly done as professors conceive metalinguistic and implicit corrective feedback more beneficial in contrast to learners' regards towards explicit corrective feedback. However, by further extending their practice, educators may take advantage of students' regards on how they preferred to be corrected in order to make adjustments to their procedures and therefore contribute greatly to enhance teachers to be formative process in writing academically.

5.3 Professors' perceptions regarding the impact of their preferred written corrective feedback on students' writing

This finding embraces professors' considerations of how their favoured error correction technique prompts students' development in the skill of writing and potentially aids the development of writing tasks. This is an important characteristic to develop considering that students are conferred the role of teacher-researchers and they are bestowed with an investigation, be classroom or research project. For such reasons, professors are responsible for providing students recommendations and corrections for the proper structuration of their papers, both in terms of content and grammar. Considering such factors, and professors' preferred techniques, it is relevant to mention their motives for applying such techniques as regarding one as more effective than others or because it

enables students' reflection, even so if they consider that there is a technique that can be more reliable than another.

Why do you perceive the previous technique(S) as the most adequate for correcting students?

IPDGR1: mmm... that's a very good question... well... I actually use metalinguistic very much, but I have detected that sometimes explicit is more effective than metalinguistic... because sometimes they may not... they are not sure of what they are correcting, and they may just do it either to comply something or because they have to do it... so we don't really know the effect. I don't know maybe... perhaps metalinguistic or explicit may be the best.

The conception of metalinguistic corrective feedback being a good technique as it improves students' awareness of their current proficiency stage and reflective capability regarding their mistakes can be considered otherwise unfruitful according to learners' knowledge and interpretive abilities of professors' corrections. Meaning, students cannot understand what professors intend to correct if they do not understand the corrective technique applied by the professor. Furthermore, metalinguistic corrective feedback may seem counterintuitive if students do not have an according level of proficiency to what they are expected to correct; hence, feedback has to be adequate to learners' proficiency level. This lack of responsiveness may be considered objectionable as learners are in 8th semester, their language proficiency should be B2+ and they should have a proper domain of corrective techniques as they have previously been exposed to them in preceding

courses. This EFL professor deems metalinguistic corrective feedback technique as his/her preferred most effective technique because of its cognitive implications on learners, though s/he is not sure whether or not metalinguistic corrective feedback is the best technique to modify learners' mistakes given that it leads EFL pupils towards ambiguity when interpreting each code.

Even though these two EFL professors are aware of the different corrective techniques' benefits when addressing students' written errors, their preferences vary based on their experiences with students throughout their professional path. Trying to shed some light over the same question, another professor enlightens what s/he deems as his/her preferred corrective technique.

PANGR2: because I think you can raise awareness, well raise students' awareness on the fact that they made a mistake, for example, if I write yesterday I go to the doctor and I include the code, the grammar code, they are going to realize it by themselves, than if I corrected it, or if I used any feedback, other feedback, so it is more useful for reflection and awareness. consciousness.

Reflecting on professors' labour of correction, educators have to consider which corrective technique can be more beneficial for students' formative process insofar as students' sensibility and capability of discerning their mistakes is an issue of paramount concern when emending them. Therefore, the metalinguistic corrective technique is applied as it grants learners a degree of autonomy and thoughtfulness that other techniques would not. Since they are not given the correction explicitly, pupils have to conduct a thorough

analysis by themselves of what their mistakes were. Additionally, students have to contemplate critically their errors and deliberately correct them.

Considering the information retrieved regarding professors' perception towards the impact of their preferred corrective technique, the main consideration is that metalinguistic corrective feedback is a very effective tool as it allows learners to contemplate their writing process. This technique is esteemed as a system of codes that offers learners detailed information regarding errors' nature, raising learners' linguistic awareness to avoid future mistakes. However, there seems to be a disparity with what is believed and what may be considered as efficient or practical. Ferris and Roberts (2008), quoted in Ellis (2009), affirm that explicit corrective feedback is not propitious to learners with a high level of proficiency as there are no cognitive demands when the correction has been given to them in a direct manner. Considering that learners from this project were in 8th semester at the time of interviewing them and applying the stimulated recalls, it can be said that they are advanced learners. They should count with a high language repertoire because they have been studying English for many years and some are native speakers and they possess a substantial knowledge of corrective techniques as they have had been exposed to them throughout the whole program. Therefore, it is of supreme importance to foster their critical capacities in order to see exponential results. Although metalinguistic codes are exposed to learners by professors in courses like Language Acquisition, Writing Composition, and Introduction to Research, some of them have struggled with the recognition of every code's meaning. Whereby, it is also important to take into account students' insights with respect to metalinguistic corrective feedback technique .

Q: So umh so, which technique does the professor mainly use?

SRJGR2: the professor mainly uses metalinguistic corrective feedback//ok

Q: And what is your opinion of the technique the professor mainly uses?

SRJGR2: Well, it can be a little bit vague because different professors have different uhh codes to correct metalinguistically umh and since it's let's say, for example, grammar, but what is it incorrect in the grammar form, is it the verb, is it the whole structure compared to the whole text or what is it that's incorrect // yes// it can be a little bit vague and ambiguous

While the previous professor states that metalinguistics brings some benefits on learners because it improves their language competences cognitively, this student asserts that the error correction through codes would not be beneficial as professors are not aligned to both the interpretation and purpose of every code; for instance, the subject participant considers that metalinguistic codes do not address the mistake directly but they give room to misinterpretation. By contrast, it was evidenced by the professor's assertion that there seems to be an uncertainty of learners' comprehensibility towards the nature of the techniques and the intention of using direct feedback is to support students' ability to self-edit their undesired linguistic products (Ferris & Robert, 2001 mentioned in Ellis, 2009). Hence, as evidenced by the professors' responses, there is a correlation between these and theory; meaning, even though metalinguistic corrective feedback has more cognitive benefits, it tends to be obscure inasmuch as learners might misinterpret the code's intention, whilst direct feedback enlightens EFL pupils through the revision path efficiently. It is

noted that metalinguistic corrective feedback fosters learners' capability of understanding their errors and preventing future ones yet if there is a necessity of approaching correction . Additionally, it was evidenced that instructors analyze the learning process in order to verify and alter the teaching and learning activities in order to assess formatively (Council of Europe, 2001). All in all, teachers to be are intended to have a degree of autonomy, they should be capable of correcting themselves and assessing their performance. They are bestowed with the responsibility of being capable language users as they will be language teachers. Therefore, either there is a disregard of the true potential of the metalinguistic technique, learners are underestimated in terms of proficiency and insight, or the explicit technique is more effective. It is paramount to make students acquainted with what every code means if the professor is fond of assessing written errors through the use of the metalinguistic corrective technique. Finally, it was evidenced that in order for the feedback process to be fruitful, it is mandatory to consider students' language proficiency level as if they are at basic level, their language competences will not be proficient enough to decode what a corrective code attempts at revising.

6. LIMITATIONS

The incessant activity of being reflective and critical was fundamental to be aware of the different constraints that could have affected or limited the encountered results in this study. First of them, this research was carried out at a public university in Pereira, Colombia, with a restricted number of participants; namely: two professors and six undergraduate students who were enrolled in the Introduction to Qualitative Research courses from 8th semester in an English language teaching program. Thus, the outcomes gathered in this study might vary in distinct contexts that are not rigorously aligned to the English language teaching field.

Even though one part of the subject participants were EFL teachers to be and were exposed to a continuous academic input related to feedback in courses like Academic Composition, Language Acquisition, or Upper-intermediate English, some of them presented misconceptions at the moment of differentiating terms like explicit and implicit corrective feedback; meaning, subject participants took signalled mistakes as a explicit corrective technique when this underlying procedure is denoted as implicit corrective feedback. Furthermore, considering this fact of unknowing academic terminology related to the English teaching field hindered a better interpretation of students' responses throughout the interviews and stimulated recalls insofar as teachers to be tended to confuse every corrective technique function and intention; whereby, it is paramount to state that subject participants' knowledgeability in any research is essential in order to assure reliability throughout the study.

Besides subject participants' misconceptions regarding some error correction techniques, another important remark has to do with the design and implementation of data collection instruments. Due to time constraints and previous preparation, the collection of data through the interview process had to be modified during its development as some questions required to be expanded on or given further arguments in order to obtain well-informed responses and regards on the question at hand. The above issue also led to the formulation of questions whose answers were already given in preceding questions; thus, opportunities to inquire into new perspectives were missed, too. Finally, another limitation encountered during the collection and data interpretation processes had to do with the difficulty of gathering teacher-students' written artifacts for analysis, as the inquirers began to collect them when the end of the semester was approaching causing some participants to hand their paper in after returning from vacations, which seriously delayed data analysis and results.

Finally, it is also worth commenting on subject participants' availability and willingness to take part in the study. On behalf of both professors and inquirers, it can be said that due to their multiple academic duties it took longer than expected to apply interviews during the first data collection stage as the arranged encounters had to be postponed several occasions. Additionally, teachers-to-be participation was, to some extent, encouraged through external motivation as one professor offered them extra points for the research course if they agreed to be in the study. The aforementioned shows some participants' lack of willingness to cooperate unless a reward of any kind is involved.

7. CONCLUSIONS

Considering that enquired participants are prospect teachers, it is paramount to evoke their capacities of understanding and providing corrective feedback in the skill of writing, more specifically in English as a foreign language. This necessity emerges as they will intervene future pupils which will, very highly, commit mistakes while communicating through written means in a foreign language course. Language educators have to confront these errors and provide learners with a pedagogical experience that enables them to improve. Thus, it is profoundly significant for teachers-to-be to know how to provide feedback efficiently and appropriately. Such events are manageable when professors are equipped with corrective techniques to foster teacher-students' language and reflective capacities on their written ability; techniques which they could apply in the future. Conclusively, it can be asserted that corrective feedback plays a significant role in the teaching-learning process of a foreign language; its successful application relies on the teacher's capability to implement a wide range of corrective feedback techniques that can help students become aware of their flaws in written language.

Considering that error correction techniques, such as metalinguistic and implicit corrective feedback, can be considered by some recipients vague or conventional, students' understanding of corrective techniques or of the correction itself can be obstructed due to a lack of lore; hence, students conceive, in general, explicit feedback as the most effective. The interviews and learners' products indicate that there seems to be a gap in learners' knowledge regarding the meaning and application of corrective techniques. When questioned for their preferred technique learners were hesitant to answer and asked

for clarification or they were clarified extra officially. Furthermore, the lack of knowledgeability was mainly evidenced when learners handed in their final paper and similar mistakes were made despite of the error having been highlighted or receiving a hint of their flaws; yet learners conceptualize feedback as a vital tool for both their formative and professional process.

Taking into account professors' repertoire of corrective techniques, it was evidenced that they aim at enabling learners' reflective and analytical process. Professors use mainly metalinguistic or implicit corrective feedback. They consider that by not handing learners the correction explicitly, learners have to critically dissect and examine their paper. This process intends to allow learners to construct their papers based on their previous learning experience and ponder on what errors and mistakes were composed. However, professors present doubts as they have analyzed that learners seem not to understand the corrective cues or highlighted aspects. This leads to corrections being made still bearing in mind students' continuous reproval. Nonetheless, the thought of corrective feedback being paramount for learners' future is imminent. Professors consider that feedback has to be continuous and allows language and professional improvement.

Following the depiction about teacher-students and professors' preferences and perceptions regarding the role of corrective feedback in written production, one important remark has to be made: a discrepancy regarding how both populations conceive error correction arouse. On behalf of students, their preferences lean towards more implicit and explicit techniques leaving metalinguistic correction as the least favorable. This contrasts with professor participants in the study whose most applied technique for correction

appears to be metalinguistic: using codes to denote students' written errors and mistakes. Such discrepancy seems to result from the lack of mutual agreement on both sides in regards to how to best approach students written products when providing corrective feedback. However, and despite such apparent discrepancy, it can also be said that applying metalinguistic feedback does not necessarily mean that teachers-to-be's learning process is hindered; yet the provision of error correction may benefit greatly from a more balanced approach to feedback in the skill of writing in which not only do professors' regards and preferences intervene, but also those from teacher-students who are directly involved and affected by such procedure.

Based on the information above, it can be concluded that both teachers-to-be and professors involved in research courses from the bilingual program conceive the role of error correction in written language as a paramount factor that fosters language and professional development. What is more, professors seem to be aware of teacher-students' concerns and lack of understanding when trying to make the corrections signalled by them through metalinguistic feedback, while students, in general, manage to make an important number of the expected adjustments to their products. Yet, such processes of providing and receiving feedback could be highly improved by getting both populations' views and preferences combined so that more student-friendly techniques and approaches to error correction can be implemented when dealing with academic written texts in English as a foreign language context.

8. PEDAGOGICAL AND RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

Pedagogical Implications

This chapter will address a variety of different pedagogical implications that both professors and teachers-to-be may want to bear in mind when delivering their teaching practices in varying foreign language contexts and settings.

Initially, it is worth commenting on the necessity of providing appropriate feedback to teacher-students' written products in order for them to improve not only their language skills but also their professional development as future language teachers. This remark gives prominence to the fact that professors must be equipped with enough error correction techniques that enable them to approach teachers-to-be's written products with efficiency and efficacy. Such challenge can be achieved by taking into consideration students' regards and preferences when receiving feedback during the process of developing their academic writing skills, so that professors start to have better results at the moment of correcting students' artifacts in writing courses.

Another aspect that requires attention has to do with the fact that even though there seems to be a clear discrepancy among teachers-to-be and professors from research courses in terms of how to address written products, little or nothing is being done to enhance this practice. After having mentioned the linguistic and professional advantages that error correction in writing has on teachers in development, it is about time professors begin to consider students' tendency to prefer either implicit or explicit feedback over metalinguistic correction. This does not imply necessarily vanishing the implementation of and exposure to metalinguistic feedback which also greatly contributes to professional growth, but it

might as well encourage professors to make more informed decisions as to how they could make use of a more balanced approach towards error correction in order to enhance this specific practice with the aim of providing students with a better experience when dealing with academic written texts. By doing so, future English language teachers from the bilingual program will probably be able to display a greater variety of pedagogical resources during their professional practice in different language scenarios, namely higher education and/or high school settings.

Research Implications

The results of this research project heighten that for future inquiries it is valuable for investigators to ponder on students' misconceptions regarding metalinguistic and implicit corrective feedback. It is relevant to have a deeper understanding of learners' constraints towards the comprehension of such corrective tools and why they regard them vague or why such a convention hinders comprehension, especially considering that teachers-to-be are obliged to have an array of corrective techniques in their arsenal. Researchers are recommended to explore, then, on future teachers' erroneous perception of what is being corrected. It is evidenced in pupils' dissident deviations towards the proposed feedback that they have conceptual deviances of what is expected of them. Hence, it is required to deepen into such aspects in order to analyze why students repeatedly commit the same mistakes despite of having a corrective cue.

as a final recommendation, it is valuable to consider the application of a similar study with a greater population. Considering that this project was conducted with a small population, meaning that it cannot carry conclusive assertions due to a lack of extent, it

could be valuable to carry out a paper of bigger proportions in order to to have more definite results of this phenomenon. Furthermore, it is recommendable to administer a study with a similar aim to learners from secondary schools, different semesters, or from English language institutes. This is relevant as learners from different semester may present different levels of awareness and comprehensiveness towards the different corrective techniques. Moreover, as prospect teachers that have already approached teaching scenarios, it is important to witness if there are great divergences among the different populations' conception and effectiveness of a corrective technique.

9. REFERENCES

- Alvira, R. (2016). *The Impact of Oral and Written Feedback on EFL Writers with the Use of Screencast*. PROFILE Journal 18 (2): 79-92. Bogotá. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15446/profile.v18n2.53397>
- Arias, E., Ramos, D., & Cárdenas, C. (2013). Retos y Realidades de la Enseñanza del Inglés en Colombia [Challenges and Realities of Teaching English in Colombia].
- Aydoğan, H., & Akbarov, A. A. (2014). *The Four Basic Language Skills, Whole Language & Integrated Skill Approach in Mainstream University Classrooms in Turkey*. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 5(9), 672.
- Birks, M., & Mills, J. (2015) Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide. (2nd Ed.) Great Britain: Henry Ling Limited.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2008). *How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students* / Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Correa, R., Martinez, M., Molina, M., Silva, J., & Torres, M. (2013) *The Impact of Explicit Feedback on EFL High School Students Engaged in Writing Tasks*. PROFILE Journal 15 (2): 149-163. Bogotá. Retrieved from: <http://www.revistas.unal.edu.co/index.php/profile/article/view/40174/42048>
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of References for Languages: Learning, Teaching, and Assessment*. Cambridge, U.K: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.
- Díaz, S. L., Echeverry, D. M., & Ramos, D. (2016). *Professors and Students' Perceptions Towards Oral Corrective Feedback in an English Language Teaching Program*. Pereira: Universidad Tecnológica de Pereira
- Dincer, A., & Seker, M. (2014). *An Insight to Students' Perceptions on Teacher Feedback in Second Language Writing Classes*. English Language Teaching Journal 7 (2): 73-83. Canada. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n2p73>
- Ellis, R. (2009). *Corrective feedback and teacher development*. L2 Journal, 1(1): 3-18. Retrieved from: <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/2504d6w3#page-1>

- Ellis, R. (2009). *A typology of written corrective feedback types*. ELT Journal 63(2), 97-106. Doi: doi:10.1093/elt/ccn023.
- Fox-Turnbull, W. (2011) *Stimulated Recall Using Autography- A Method for Investigating Technology Education*. New Zealand: University of Canterbury
- Fraenkel, J., Wallen, N., & Hyun, H. (2012). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*, (8th Ed.). San Francisco State University: McGraw-Hill.
- Giraldo, M. C., & Perry, R. A. (2008). *Treating ESL Writing Errors: Balancing Form and Content*. HOW Journal 15:107-123. Bogotá. Retrieved from: <https://www.howjournalcolombia.org/index.php/how/article/view/90/88>
- Harmer, J. (2011). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*, (4th Ed), Uk: Pearson Longman.
- Huber, R. A., & Headrick, A.M. (1999). *Handwriting Identification: Facts and fundamentals*. New York: CRC Press.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*.
- Lyster, R. and Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37-66. Retrieved from: http://digitool.library.mcgill.ca/R/?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=19364&local_base=GEN01-MCG02
- Merriam, S.B. (1998) *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education :Revised and Expanded from Case Study Research in Education*, (2nd Ed) U.S.A. Jossey-Bass Books.

- Merriam, S.B. (2009) *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education :Revised and Expanded from Case Study Research in Education*, (2nd Ed) U.S.A. Jossey-Bass Books.
- Ministerio de Educación Nacional de Colombia. (2016). *Pedagogical Principles and Guidelines Suggested English Curriculum*, (1st Ed.). Cali. Universidad del Norte.
- Nasr, R. (1994) *Whole Education: A new direction to fill the relevance gap*. United States: University Press of America.
- Richards, J. C. (2001) *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*, (1st Ed) U.K. Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (1998). *Sociolinguistics* (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press.
- Usma, J. A. (2009). *Education and Language Policy in Colombia: Exploring Processes of Inclusion, Exclusion, and Stratification in Times of Global Reform*. PROFILE Journal (11). Bogotá. Retrieved from:
<http://www.revistas.unal.edu.co/index.php/profile/article/viewFile/10551/11014>
- Ur, P. (1999) *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- Xie, F., & Jiang, X. M. (2007). *Error Analysis and the EFL Classroom Teaching*. *Online Submission*, 4(9), 10-14.
- Zhao, B. (2009). *Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake in Primary School EFL Classrooms in China*. *The Journal of Asia TEFL* 6 (3), 45-72. Retrieved from:
[:www.asiatefl.org/main/download_pdf.php%3Fi%3D210%26c%3D1419309567+&cd=1&hl=es&ct=clnk&gl=co](http://www.asiatefl.org/main/download_pdf.php%3Fi%3D210%26c%3D1419309567+&cd=1&hl=es&ct=clnk&gl=co)